

7.

A Seasonable

VINDICATION

OF THE

Truly Catholick Doctrine

OF THE

Church of England :

I N

R E P L Y

T O

Dr. *Sherlock's* ANSWER to *Ano-*
nymus his three Letters concerning
Church-Communion.

Errare possum, Hereticus aut Schismaticus esse nolo.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Jonathan Robinson*, at the Golden Lion in
St. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1683.

VINDICATION

OF THE

CHURCH

REPLY

TO
DR. SHELTON'S ANSWER TO
THE CHURCH

OF THE CHURCH

LONDON

Printed by J. Johnson, St. Paul's Church-yard



Anonymus his **R E P L Y** to
Dr. Sherlock's Answer to his
Three Letters about Church-
Communion.

S I R,



BEING neither Prophet, nor Prophet's Son, nor having any outward Sign, whereby I might judge of your pleasure to teach me my *Catechism* in private; I, by publishing my *Objections* against your *Discourses* about Church-Communion, have given you the opportunity of *glutting and satiating your Revenge*, (according to your own decent Expression of Divine Justice) and insulting over the Ignorance of an ill-taught Lay-man, who knew not what it was to press Dr. *Sherlock* to explain himself, in a Matter wherein his own Brethren, such as are as far from the Imputation of *Deism* or *Socinianism* as himself, and are not likely to *contemn the Notion of a Church*, and of the *Evangelical Priesthood and Sacraments*, have been highly dissatisfied, as he himself well knows.

You blame me, for offering no Argument to disprove any Thing you say, nor shewing wherein lay the

Dr. *Sherlock's* Letter to *Anonym.* pag. 54.

Sherlock's Discourse of the knowledge of Christ 2d ed. p. 32. & 43.

See his Letter, p. 55.

Ibid. p. 57.

Sherlock's
Answer to
Danson, p. 6.

Weakness of your Arguments : As if it were nothing to urge to a Man the plain Consequences of his Doctrine, which (as you know who teaches us) is a plain way of Reasoning, which all Men allow of, to convince Men of the Unsoundness of their Doctrines.

His Letter
to Anonym.
P. 33.

This perhaps I may have done in the first and second Letters: And for my third, where you say, *I run nothing but Dregs and Lies*, and where you think little new, but Repetitions of old Queries; perhaps some will believe, it was not altogether impertinent to shew wherein your Art lay, in applying that to a Church in one Sence, which belong'd to it in another.

Ibid. p. 57.

But admit all this were nothing to the disproof of what you undertook; I think it had been enough, if I had only put such Questions as might oblige you to explain your self: And if your Discourse stood in need of it, you may well think your self concerned in my Queries, and ought to thank me for putting you upon a Purgation.

Ibid. p. 5.

Which you have made in such a manner, as if your Trial had been by Fire.

Truly I should have been glad to have found it done with such Charity and Candor, as becomes a Messenger of the Prince of Peace, and might have given some reasonable satisfaction, that you aim at something better, than running down at any rate those who have the misfortune to think otherwise than you do.

Ibid. p. 53.

You complain indeed, that I have not treated you with that Civility which I owe your Person, or your Profession; nay, as good as tell me, I have been scandalously rude, when you wish for my own sake I had

had carried my self better. Truly, if it be such Rudeness to charge a Clergy-man with what one takes to be the Import of his Doctrine, and calling it uncharitable, or owing to ill Principles, where he believes it so, I confess my self guilty. Yet I appeal to all unbiass'd Men, whether those foul Representations of Christianity, which I still conceive to lurk within the former general Assertions, were animadverted on with that Severity which ought to have been.

But yet it seems you were resolved to be even with me in the worst Sence. Wherefore, to pass by the telling me in effect, that a Fool may ask more His Letter, Questions than a wise Man can answer, but that *P. 57.* mine are very foolish and impertinent Questions, *generally nothing to the purpose,* (which is such a Rebuke, as if you should bid me ask no more with a dirty Face) you insinuate, *That I espouse a Schism or Faction, only to shew my Wit in defending it, and to make my self considerable by espousing a Party, and am no hearty Lover of the Church of England; that it is not in my Nature to be civil to a Clergy-man.* *Pag. 56. Pag. 21, & 56. Pag. 53.*

That I disown part of the due Authority of *Bishops:* That I think of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as a *very indifferent Ceremony:* That I designed to *affront* Dr. Stillingfleet, and Dr. Tillotson, whom I greatly reverence; and particularly, would charge the former with endeavouring to prove *all Church-Communion needless.* *Pag. 54. Pag. 48, & 50.*

That I *excuse Dissenters upon such Principles as tend to undermine Christianity, &c.* *Pag. 56.*

But these Insinuations, to which I shall not give their due Epithete, were not enough for your purpose; but you must come to a positive Charge, which

His Letter,
p. 50.

which you scatter up and down your Answer, as that *I never spare any Man's Reputation to serve my Designs*; and that my *Reproaches and Commendations are but different Ways of Abuse*.

Pag. 45.

Nay, you are so indiscreet to charge upon me what I chiefly write against, and blame you for, which is, *That where two Churches are not in Communion with each other, they cannot both belong to the same Body, but that it is evident, that one of these must needs be cut off from Christ's Body*.

Anonymus's
3d Letter,
p. 26.

Where you take advantage of the Printer's Mistake, putting it is, for is it? which I made by way of Question, as manifestly appears by the Coherence.

Pag. 53.

Pag. 54.

But the dreadfullest part of your Charge is in the ghostly Counsel which you vouchsafe me, where you tell me, *It is evident I have a great Spite at the whole Order of the Clergy: That I am guilty of too plain a Contempt of all Church-Authority: That tho I pretend to be in Communion with the Church of England, I make the Church it self a very needless and insignificant Thing, for I know no necessity of communicating with any Church: That I will not allow it to be Schism, to separate from the Church: And that I think it a pretty indifferent thing, whether Men be baptized, or not, or by whom*. Then, to deal plainly with me, you think *I have more need to be taught my Catechism, than to set up for a Writer of Books: And that the Consequence of the Way I am in, is no less than a Contempt of all revealed and instituted Religion*. And what, of most Men, I should not have expected from Dr. Sherlock, my Notions are condemned, as owing to Deists and Socinians.

Pag. 55.

And

And thus, Sir, in the Spirit of Meekness and Charity, you have drawn up a very fair Charge.

You may treat me with as much scorn and contempt as you please, and I shall consider it but as your natural Infirmary; where God Almighty makes allowances, we ought: But I ought not to be silent under such Reproaches, of which your own Conscience cannot but acquit every Thing that I have said or wrote to you.

And further, no reasonable Man can think me concerned to vindicate my self: The most solemn Protestations concerning my more private Thoughts, would be but scoffed at, by them who are resolved to believe the worst.

And my Comfort is, no Orthodox Clergy-man, that knows me, will be so uncharitable: But to bring Compurgators of such, (whose Friendships, as they are *dulce decus meum*, so they are *presidium* too against such fatal Miscarriages) would but expose their venerable Names to such Usage as I have met with.

But be that never so hard, for once I will set an Example to a Clergy-man, and shew, that I can contain my self after all these causeless Calumnies, tho' you cannot bear to be told of the Truth.

Wherefore I shall calmly shew,

I. How groundless both your open and imply'd Accusations are against me.

II. What cause I had to put you upon explaining your self.

III. How

III. How unsatisfactory your Explanation is in its own Nature.

So much of your Charge as I am concern'd to answer particularly, resolves it self into these general Heads.

1. My Want of Love to the Church of *England*, and taking part with Dissenters, out of Zeal for their Cause, or Vain-Glory.
2. That I have a Spite at the whole Order of Clergy-men, and disown part of the Power of Bishops.
3. That I designed to affront *Dr. Stillingfleet*, and *Dr. Tillotson*.
4. That I discover a Contempt of all Church-Authority, and think the Church it self an insignificant Thing.
5. And lastly ; That I am guilty of *Deism* and *Socinianism*. And,
That my Principles tend to undermine Christianity, and to the Contempt of all revealed Religion.

First Article.

In the first *Article* you would argue me guilty of Hypocrisy, in pretending to be in constant Communion with the Church of *England*, when I want that Love for it, which is essential to Union and Communion with it ; or of a great deal of Vanity, in labouring to shew my Wit in the Defence of a Cause,

Cause, which I my self know to stand in need of Wit and Artifice.

But if it happen, that the Church of *England* is no more concerned in your Censures, than perhaps you may think your self to be in the Doctrine of its *Articles* or *Homiles*.

And that it gives you no warrant to call the Dissenters *Schismatics*, and such as are deprived of the *Influences of the Divine Spirit*, while they scruple Conformity.

My taxing you with want of Charity towards *Dissenters*, will be as far from the suspicion of such a Zeal for them, as implies a Dis-esteem of our *Church*, or such a Defence of their Cause, as may be imputed to *Wantonness* or *Vanity*, that it may be more like the Act of that *Samaritan*, who took care of the poor Man, who had been most barbarously used by Thieves, and could meet with no pity from the Priest and the Levite, who *past by on the other side*. Luke 10.

Whatever you think of this Matter, I am bold to affirm, that our *Church* no-where warrants your Assertions, either in its *Articles*, *Homilies*, or *Canons*. Indeed in the *Canons of King James*, the Authority of which, as to us Lay-men, I need not here enquire into, I find *Schismatici* mentioned in some of the Titles, but not in any of the *Canons*, to be sure by no means applied in your manner.

But then you tell me, *No Man who had any kindness for the Church, with which he pretends to hold Communion, would make such a vile Insinuation, as if profest Atheists were admitted to Communion*. But certainly there may be a *profest Atheist*, tho he doth not profess himself so at the time of his communicating, His Letter, pag. 21.

Vid. the Dr's Resolut. of Cases of Consc. about Church Communion, p. 6.

cating, or to those Persons who receive him to it. Besides, if you should admit such an one, looking upon him as entitled to it by his *Baptism*, it would be no Reflection upon the Governours of our Church, who could not but expect better things from you.

Second Article.

But, secondly, I must be exposed, as one that denies the Bishops part of their just Power, and that has a great Spite at the whole Order of the Clergy. The fancied Ground for this was from that part of my Preface, where I urge the necessity of Episcopal Government, if it were only because of the Extravagancies of many of the inferior Clergy. My Words were these :

Preface to Anonymus's Letters. Sure I am, an outward Government in the Church is requisite, if it were only for the restraining those Men, who, out of confidence of their own Abilities, will be venting Notions, which none but Men of great Subtilty can make one believe to be agreeable either to Scripture, or to that Doctrine to which they have subscribed, and declared their unfeigned Assent and Consent. And methinks it were enough to remove Mens Prejudices against the Episcopal Government, to consider how needful it is, that some of the most Learned and Discreet should be chosen from among the Herd of Clergy-men, to oversee, admonish, and censure those who are apt to go beyond their due Bounds.

Now because I mentioned this alone, as Cause enough for the establishing Episcopal Government, and had no occasion of considering any further Use or Power, I am charg'd with knowing no other Use of

of a Bishop, but to *oversee, admonish, and censure those Clergymen, who are apt to go beyond their Bounds* : Which is just as if by mentioning some particular Flower of the Imperial Crown of this Realm, I should disown all others.

Yet if it be possible to give you satisfaction, I shall tell you what our *Church* has taught me in this Point ; which is : ' That the Office of Bishops and Pastors is to *Homilies.*
' *praise good Men for well-doing*, that they may continue *2d Serm. of*
' therein ; and to rebuke and correct, by the Word of *Charity,*
' God, the Offences and Crimes of evil-disposed Persons. *f. 44.*

But then 'tis supposed to be very evident, that *I have a great Spite* at the whole Clerical Order, because I speak of a Bishop, as one chosen from among the *Herd* of Clergy-men.

If I called them such an *Herd* as some represent Dissenters, it had (I must confess) been inexcusable. But since I term the Bishop, *one learned and discreet*, chose out of that Number, I know not why *Herd* may not be as innocently taken as *Flock*.

And I hope, none that think themselves within the Fold of Christ, will be angry at being called a *Flock* ; But then the Word being used chiefly upon the account of such Straglers, perhaps it needs not so long an Apology.

However, you know who has before me been obliged to own, that there is an *Euphemia due from us, when we speak of some Things.* *V. Sherlock's*
Def. of his Discourse concerning the knowledge of Christ, p. 529.

Wherefore if any sober Divine is angry at it, it shall be *Flock*, if he pleases.

But I may be confident no such would tax me with want of being *seriously religious*, and affronting God's *Servants*, without due regard to their Master, meerly *His Letter to Anon. p. 53.*

for want of that *Euphemia*, which one cannot greatly offend against by one single Word, of no ill signification.

I am sure you, of all Men, have no reason to press hard upon me in this Particular.

Third Article.

That I may be depriv'd of the Patronage of two such great Luminaries of our Church, as Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and Dr. *Tillotson*, you tax me with a *Design of affronting* Dr. S. and *dealing with* the other great Man at the same rate.

Pag. 49.

Pag. 50.

Secret Things belong to God; but I am sure you could have no Revelation from above of any such Design; nor can any thing that I have said look that way.

Affure your self, I cited the Words against the *absolute Necessity of Church-Communion*, (whence you ground your Reflection) in the same Sence as I receive them, which is in their utmost Latitude, but by no means as if they would set aside all Government in the Church. But you are certainly guilty of the *Affront* against them, if you think there is any harm in the Quotations, or as if I expose their Failings thereby. I will not here return upon you, *That you never spare any Man's Reputation, to serve your Design, &c.* which would come as properly from me, as it did from you.

*Wid. Preface
to the three
Letters.*

But when you were upon such Authorities, you would have done well to have reconciled your self to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Sence of *Schism*, which, if his Judgment be valuable in competition with Dr. *Sherlock's*, lies not in a voluntary Departure out of any particular Church, but the true Catholick Church. And the Reason which he gives for

for it, is the Ground which I go upon. If you will teach me my Catechism better in this Point, I am very ready to learn.

Fourth Article.

The fourth Article has many in the Belly of it ; for under the supposed Contempt of Church-Authority, are, in your Sence, contained :

1. The thinking the Church it self an insignificant Thing, and that no causeless Separation from it can be a Schism.

2. A despising the *Evangelical Priesthood*, as you call it.

3. The looking upon the Sacraments as *very indiffe-* Pag. 54.
rent Ceremonies.

1. In the first, you (as is usual with you) would take advantage of your own Confusion, in blending together the Notion of the Catholick, and of a particular *Church* ; For tho one may think that it signifies not much, or is not one's Duty to communicate with every particular sound Church ; yet it is, no doubt, always his Duty to communicate, actually, or in Inclination, with the Church of Christ, in that which essentially constitutes it his Church : Nay, and there may be a Schismatical Separation, even upon the account of lesser Matters. But my Question is, Whether there may not be a Separation, causeless in the Nature of the Thing occasioning it, tho not in relation to the Party's Conscience who scruples it, and that without Schism.

But as, Dr. *Stillingsfleet* rightly distinguishes, between what is necessary to Salvation, and what is necessary to the Government of the Church ; my receiving his Sence, *Preface to the three Letters.*
has.

has sufficiently anticipated and removed this Imputation, unless you will fix it upon him too.

2. But for the second; If by an *Evangelical Priesthood*, you mean such as is necessary to offer up Sacrifices for us; I know of no such upon Earth, by the Gospel-Institution.

3. For the third, which may take in what may seem omitted on the foregoing Head; I desire to be inform'd, what one Passage has faln from me, which looks like an excusing the *Contempt or Neglect of the Sacraments*, or of them to whom ordinarily it belongs to administer them. Yet methinks you do not duly consider, that a Thing may be one's Duty by virtue of a positive Command, and consequently ought to be done, when fit Circumstances concur; yet not being enjoin'd as the necessary Means to Salvation, when such Circumstances are wanting, the actual Exercise is not required; yet it does not follow, that therefore 'tis *indifferent*.

What the Judicious *Hooker* says of Baptism, is doubtless equally applicable to the other Sacrament, and all the Parts of the Office of the Ministry.

Hooker's
Ecclef. Pol.
p. 332.

'That God (*saieth he*) hath committed the Ministry of Baptism unto special Men; it is for Order's sake in his Church, and not to the end that their Authority might give being, or add force to the Sacrament it self.

Answer to
Anon. P. 49.

To this purpose I did before cite the deservedly esteemed Authors, *Dr. Stillingfleet*, *Dr. Tillotson*, and their Forerunner, *Mr. Chillingworth*; yet certainly this does not overthrow the Necessity of a settled Ministry, and a regular Authority in the Church.

It were an easy matter here to make a pompous shew of Reading; I shall only observe to you, that some of my Questions related to the supposed absolute Necessity of

of receiving the Sacrament of Baptism; others, to the Authority of them who administer it. Indeed that of the Lord's Supper was not mentioned by me, because, as you had handled the Matter, the chief Dispute was about the forming of a Church, and *Church-Communion*, which you tell us, is something antecedent to all the Acts and Offices of Communion. Resolut. of Cases, p. 10.

I must tell you, I had my Warrant for such Interrogations as I made upon both Heads, from very great Lights in our Church.

Mr. Hooker, when he was to argue against the Dissenters of his Time, found them to stand much upon the Authority of their Ministry, which they contended to be by *Divine Right*, and that others could not duly administer the Sacraments. Now tho that great Man asserts, *Hooker, That it hath been constantly held, as well touching Believers f. 317. as Martyrs, that Baptism taken away by Necessity, is supplied by desire of Baptism, and to Children, by a presumed Desire: Yet he chiefly addresses himself to prove, That Baptism by any Man, in case of Necessity, is valid; which, Ibid. f. 320. he says, was the Voice of the whole World heretofore.*

But a learned Oxford Professor, Mr. George Abbot, in a Theological Lecture there, *de Circumcisione & Baptismo*, goes to prove it unlawful, for any of the Laity to usurp upon the Ministerial Office in this, because Baptism is not absolutely necessary in it self. He concludes his elaborate Reading thus: *Interea tamen ista sunt, quæ hodiernâ oratione accepistis: Externo Sacramento non sic astringi & alligari Dei gratiam, ut sine ipso salvare aliquando nolit. Ideoq; & diffidenter quoad Deum, & audacter quoad se, Feminas Laicosq; facere, qui baptizare aggrediuntur. Tertio, tamen cum sigillum sit impressum, non esse iterandum.* *Questiones in Scholâ Theol. per G. Abbot, edit. 1598, p. 106.*

Fifh.

Fifth Article.

The fifth Article, which is not so explicit as the foregoing, of being guilty of *Deism*, *Socinianism*, and what not, is laid but as a Consequence of the former ; wherefore that Imputation being wip'd off, I fear no Man's charging me with this.

And to deal as plainly with you, as you, I thank you, have done with me, I should have expected this sooner from another Man. Whatever you or I say, the World will judg, whether he is most likely to be guilty of *Deism*, *undermining Christianity*, and *contemning all revealed Religion*, who calls your Opinions in question ; or he who will argue, that it is as necessary to communicate with every sound Part of the Catholick Church, as with any ; and that one is as much obliged to communicate as a *Member* with some particular, visible, sound Part, as to be a *Christian* ; and that not only by joining in the *Purity of Faith and Worship*, (for that he tells us Hereticks might do) but in all other Acts or Terms of Communion : And that notwithstanding the Efficacy which God Almighty has promised to a true lively Faith in the Merits of Christ Jesus, it is as necessary to Salvation to know which of the Churches, divided in Accidentals, is in the right, and with which we are bound to communicate, rejecting all divided Communions for Schismatical, as it is to be of the Christian Religion. Such sort of *Mediums* must needs do as great Disservice to Christianity, as counterfeit Miracles to the true ; and he who imposes the Belief of both, as of equal Authority, or under equal Necessity, to my thinking, bids pretty fair for the *undermining* and *contempt* of all.

Ref. of Cafes, p. 9.

Gods Coveⁿt, is with the whole Body of Christians, as united in one Communion.

Ibid. p. 30.

Vindicat. of Def. p. 70.

Resolut. of Cafes, p. 37, 38.

For *Socinianism*, not knowing upon what account I His Letter should come to be caution'd against it, I should think it to *Anonym.* used meerly as a Term of Reproach, to be given of course P. 35. when a Man is angry, and wants better Arguments, were it not that perhaps you might do it designedly, to prevent my joining in that Charge, which others have in this respect undertaken to. make good against your self; and *crying Whore first*, as they say, would oblige me to find another Addition for you.

Truly I shall not go about to retort it, not being at leisure to tell you, wherein you may seem not to have answered fully, or to have slighted many Things as *Buffoonry*, which have been very closely, as well as acutely urged. *Vid. his Defence and Continuat.*

I shall only observe upon good Authority, that the *Socinians* give themselves a greater Liberty of enquiring into the Modes of Existencies, and the Nature of Divine Mysteries, than becomes short-sighted Mortals. And if other Men, equally full of themselves, happen to differ from them, when they adventure upon their own way of explaining those sublime Truths, which retire to be the Objects of our Admiration, rather than of a distinct Perception; If the Scripture-Account which the Homilies of our Church afford them, be look'd on as too great a stinting of their Spirit of Enquiry, they have no great reason to expect, that God's Grace should be engaged to protect them from dangerous Errors, seeing they attempt to be *wise above what is written*. *P. 534. Mr. Chillingworth's Pref.*

And perhaps he who will reproach as *magical* any Notion of the Union of true Believers with Christ Jesus, and with each other, which does not agree with his *Po- Viridic. of the Def. of Dr. Stilling.* litical Scheme, or with the visible Connection of the P. 46. Parts of a natural Body, may take to himself as dangerous

rous a Latitude ; and then we need not wonder, if he apply to the Church of Christ what he has observed of a natural Body, *Viz.*

Vindic p. 38.

That the Union of every Member with the Body, is its Union with that part of the Body which is next, &c.

Had he but made Provision for the Cloaths too, and had argued, that that part of the Body which is naked, cannot be united to that which is cloathed, it might have come up more fully to his purpose of proving a necessity of Union in Accidentals, as well as in Essentials.

Pray the next time you see our loving Friend W. S. tell him so much is expected from him.

Having said what I conceiv'd fitting, for an Antidote against the spreading of your Reflections upon me, I shall here justify the Pertinency of my Questions to you, and shew,

II. What Cause I had to put you upon explaining your self, concerning the Notions of Church-Communion.

Letter to A-
nonym. p. 2.

My apparent Design being to do this, you have no reason to blame me for not giving you *your own Words, with that dependance and connection, in which the whole Strength of the Discourse consists* ; for had that been never so well laid together, I ought to believe it to proceed upon some false Ground, as being contrary to those Notions, which must be antecedent to the Belief of all revealed Religion.

Vid. Dr Still.
The Faith of
Protestants re-
duced to Prin-
ciples, p. 487.

Vid. Mr. D's
Reply to
Mr. Baxter.

You know one, who thinks himself not concern'd what Consequences are charged upon his *Hypothesis*, so that he prove it *positively true*. Perhaps you may be

may be as confident of yours, as he was of his.

'Twas enough for me to oblige you to speak plainly what your Notion was. I must confess, I did suspect it of *D—lism*, which indeed you overthrow in that Book to which you refer me for my Satisfaction; but would establish one much weaker, and with less shew of Reason.

That which made me suspect your Principle to be that way, was, Your asserting the *absolute Necessity* for every Man who lives here, as he would be a Member of Christ's Body, to communicate with the National Church, because of its being a sound part of the Catholick Church. Resol. of Cases of Consc. p. 38

To which end you held,

1. That 'tis as necessary for every Man to communicate with some particular visible sound Church, *as to be a Christian*. Vid. è contr. B. Morton's Apol. Cathol. p. 32, & p. 40. Resol. p. 31.
2. That the only visible way God has of forming a Church, is by *granting a Church-Covenant*, which is the Divine Charter whereon the Church is founded, and investing some Persons with Power and Authority to receive others, according to the Terms and Conditions of the Covenant, and by such Covenant-Rites, and Forms of Admission, as he is pleased to institute, which under the Gospel is *Baptism*, as under the Law it was *Circumcision*. Ibid. p. 5. N. B. V When I had charg'd the Consequence of your Opinion to be such as Church Governours please, you opposed it not. Vid. 3d Letter, p. 28. Resol. of Cases, p. 5.
3. That no Man can be a *Member of the Church*, or in *Covenant with God*, who is not *visibly admitted* into God's Covenant by *Bapptism*. Ibid. p. 33.
4. That which makes any thing in a strict Sence an Act of Church-Communion, is, that it is performed in the Fellowship of the Apostles, or in Communion with the Bishops and Ministers of the Church.

Resol. of Ca-
ses, pag. 7.

5. That 'tis absurd to gather a Church out of a Church of baptized Christians.

Ibid. pag. 48.

6. That the Divine Spirit confines his Influences to the Unity of the visible Church.

Now your Business being to enforce the Necessity of conforming to, and communicating with the National Church, I think I gave your Argument upon these Assertions taken together, all imaginable Advantage, by deriving the Church-Power upon the Officers of our Church, in such manner as the first Founder of this Notion amongst us has done.

Letter to *Ano-*
nym. p. 4.

And whereas you own that Paragraph, of the *visible Way of forming a Church*, as the only Passage looking this way, you manifestly conceal the rest; and therefore have no such reason to laugh at me, for making Queries upon a *mistaken Hypothesis* of my own, which do not concern you. I leave it to others to judg, how truly you affirmed, *That there is not one Word of all this Matter in that Discourse which I pretended to sum up.*

Ibid. p. 5.

'Tis evident, that many of these Things, here faithfully laid together, are not defensible upon any other *Hypothesis*.

Vindic. of the
Defence of
Dr. S. p. 343.

I must own, you well oppose that, in what you say against a *late* learned and ingenuous *Author*: Yet you know that you have given suspicion of your having taken up other Notions of his, besides what are already mentioned; as where you say, *Christianity is nothing else but Mystical Judaism*, which you may see confuted in Dr. *Barrow's* Treatise of the *Unity of the Church*.

Ibid. p. 13.

But this may suffice to shew you, that I had reason to put to you the Questions which I did, and which I believe to be pertinent, both to that *Hypothesis*, and to so much

much of it, as goes along with those unwary Assertions, which you have not in the least retracted.

But the Notion which you here declare, and for which you refer me to your Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillington*, is what I am sure very few that heard your Sermons could guess at: For who could have imagined, that such is the Nature of *Catholick Communion*, Answer to Anonymus, p. 5. that he is a *Schismatick* from the whole *Catholick Church*, who separates from any sound Part of the *Catholick Church*, tho it be in Matters accidental, and by no means essential to it, nay, where the Church has no Authority over him. And however, if he communicate with two Churches, which are in a State of Separation from each other, he is a *Schismatick* too. As if they must needs cease to be sound Churches, if one scruples and condemns the other, for imposing some accidental Things, which that requires not of its Members.

You will say perhaps, that you put it of a State of Separation, which you elsewhere express by renouncing Communion. Which is manifestly a false Term; for who knows how much Uncharitableness you may justly charge upon a Renunciation?

Wherefore Mr. *Chillingworth* tells the subtil Jesuit; Chillingworth f. 15. *Notwithstanding all your Errors, we do not renounce your Communion totally and absolutely, but only leave communicating with you in the Practice and Profession of your Errors: The Trial whereof will be to propose some Form of worshipping God, taken wholly out of Scripture; and here- if we refuse to join with you, and not till then, may you say, we have utterly and absolutely abandoned your Communion.*

But you very well know my Queries were about pious Letters to Dr. S. pag. 4. Dissenters, such as are in Charity with all Men, and are ready

Letters to
Dr. Sh. p. 9.

Vid. 3d Letter,
p. 16.

ready to *communicate with any Church, which requires more of them, than what they conceive to be their Duty, according to the Divine Covenant.* And you may think these to be in as bad a condition as *Murderers and Adulterers*, if you please.

III. I shall now apply my self, to shew how unsatisfactory your Explanation of your self is in its own Nature.

Letter to A-
non. p. 6.

Resol. of Ca-
ses of Confc.
p. 10.

Vindic. of the
Def. of Dr. Stil.
p. 360.
Letter to A-
non. p. 4.

I. As to the first, *Whether such Dissenters as above described, who were baptized by their own Pastors, are let into the Catholick Church?* You own they are, and therein depart from Mr. D. But you say, the Question is of *their continuing Schismatics*; which is in effect a denying what before you granted: For if they were *Schismatics* from the beginning, according to your Sense, they were never let into the Church, and so have no Right to any *Act of Christian Communion*; Nay, being they live where there is a Church, which you say they ought to obey and with which they ought to communicate, you do suppose, that the Pastors and People do not keep their part of the Divine Covenant; and that the Sacraments administred and received among such, are *invalid or inefficacious*, as being in *opposition to, and contempt of the ordinary Governors of the Church.*

But surely *sober Dissenters* will deny, that their receiving so as they think necessary for them, is such an opposition and contempt of the ordinary Governors. If it will be so taken by Men, they cannot but hope that God will be more merciful.

But pray how comes it to pass, that our Church receives to its Communion those who in your Sense were

never *Christianized*, being *baptized in a Schism*? Certainly the Rebaptization of Hereticks, which is charged upon the *African Fathers* as a *Mistake*, was but a due procedure upon your Grounds: For the Heresy of some of them, as we are told, lay only in their *Schism*, that is, in their setting up Altar against Altar; or in *Opposition* to them to whom 'tis supposed they ought to have submitted, or conformed.

Vindic. of the
Defence, p. 370.

Ibid. p. 53.

Ibid. p. 57.

Now upon this Account their Church-Acts were invalid: Wherefore either Hereticks and Schismatics ought to be rebaptized, or else their Acts are valid, notwithstanding their Opposition to the ordinary Governors; the contrary to which you affirm.

If their Acts are not valid, then the *African Fathers* were not in the wrong; whereas in that Book which you make the Standard in this Controversy, 'tis affirm'd, both that those Fathers were in the wrong, for rebaptizing those whose Heresies lay in their Schism, &c. And that the Sacraments received amongst such, were invalid, or *inefficacious*, or *without effect*, as the Phrase is elsewhere varied.

Ibid. p. 360.

2. The second, which was put in relation to Dissenters here, you say, is a *captious Question*; Thus it was, *Whether the Submission to the Power and Censures of this Church, which all must own to be a sound Church, be part of the Divine Covenant, which unites the Members of the Catholick Church to God, and to each other.*

And that it may not be observed how this presses upon you, you would represent it as spoken in relation to all the People of the World. Truly I never thought of any Thing so wild: Yet I find, now you explain your self, that it were not improper for your Notion, which supposes

Letter to A.
non. p. 6.

Letter to Anon
p. 8.

supposes, that we ought to communicate with a sound Church, whether it has Authority over us or no ; which wants no more to expose it, than to retort some of your own Words : *For your way of arguing is, as if a Man should say, there is a divine Law to obey Civil Magistrates.* Therefore into whatever Government you come, whether as Ambassador from a Foreign Prince, or otherwise, you are bound to live according to the Laws of that Government, in every respect, as much as a Native. And for Foreigners to enjoy several Immunities from Taxes, and the like, is contrary to the Fundamental Laws of Government.

Ibid. p. 41.

Ibid. p. 6.

But you are positive, that Obedience to the Church of England is a Duty incumbent on those which are, or ought to live in Obedience to this particular Church: That is, they who ought to live in Obedience, ought to live in Obedience ; which is a greater Blunder surely, than my speaking only of Power and Censures, when I was talking of Communion :— For surely the submitting to the Churches Terms of Communion, is submitting to its Power. Well, however, this Submission, you say, may be called a Part of the Divine Covenant. Which gives me occasion to mind you of what our *Homilies* say about Obedience to Human Laws.

Ibid. p. 7.

Homilies. 2d
Serm. of good
VVorks, f. 35.

‘ God hath appointed his Laws, whereby his Pleasure
‘ is to be honoured : His pleasure is also, that all Men
‘ Laws, not being contrary unto his Laws, shall be ob-
‘ beyed and kept, as good and necessary for every
‘ Common-Weal, but not as Things wherein principally
‘ his Honour resteth.

‘ And all Civil and Man’s Laws either be, or should
‘ be made to bring Men the better to keep God’s Laws
‘ that

‘that consequently or following, God should be the
‘better honoured by them.

‘Howbeit the Scribes and *Pharisees* were not content
‘that their Laws should be no higher esteemed than
‘other positive and Civil Laws, nor would not have
‘them called by the Name of *Temporal Laws*, but *Holy*
‘*Traditions*; and would have them esteemed not only
‘for a right and true worshipping of God, *as God's Laws*
‘*be indeed*, but also for the most high honouring of God,
‘to which the Commandments of God should give place.

Or part of the
Divine Cove-
nant.

St. *Paul*, speaking of those who scrupled eating some
Meats, upon their apprehension that they were unclean,
which he tells them was a causless Scruple in the Nature
of the Thing, tho not as to their Consciences, assures
them, that,

He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth
not of Faith; for whatsoever is not of Faith, is Sin. Rom. 14. 23.

If you will say, this was spoke where there was no
humane Law to determine its Indifference; I desire you
to consider, whether such an Answer favours not of
that *Pharisaism* which our Church condemns.

But certain it is, if active Obedience in the Matter
which one scruples, which is Submission to the Power
of the Church, be or may be called Part of the Divine,
Covenant, which unites us to God, and to each other,
there can be no Suspension of *Communion* because of
doubt; but he is out of God's Covenant, and must be
damn'd, continuing so, who does not actually conform
to those very Things which he conscienciously scruples;
nay, and the Church may excommunicate him while he
is under this Doubt: For you know who teaches us,
that it is impossible that a Church, which is not *Schis-*

D

matical

Vindic. of the
Def. of Dr. S.
p. 416.

statistical in its Terms, that is, (as seems there meant) which imposes nothing in it self contrary to God's Law, can *excommunicate schismatically*. Indeed the Excommunication, according to that Notion, does but declare the State he was in before; for by not actually obeying that part of the Divine Covenant, the Man was depriv'd of all other possible Means of Salvation; agreeably to which the Defender of Dr. *Stillingfleet* says:

Ibid. p. 116.

'When our Saviour so expressly asserts, *Whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven*: If by *binding* and *loosing*, we will understand 'putting out or receiving into the Church, (which that 'Author plainly doth but immediatly before) it makes 'the Communion of the Church absolutely necessary to 'Salvation.'

This shews that my Consequence was rightly inferr'd, when I argued,

That if Submission to the Power and Censures of the Church be part of the Divine Covenant: then, as he who is not admitted into this Church, is no Member of the Catholick, and has no Right to any of the Benefits of being a Member of Christ's Body; so it is with every one who is excluded by Church-Censures, tho excommunicated for a slight Contempt or Neglect, nay, for a wrongful Cause.

Letter to A-
nonymus, p. 24.

Your Answer to this, is of one who lives in *Eng-land*, and renounces Communion; when the Question is of withdrawing, or refusing, because of real Scruples, which you will have to be an *adhering to their own private Fancies*, and to proceed from *Pride and Opinionativeness*,

nativeness, because they don't believe as the Church believes.

But then you say in general Terms, *Whoever is excommunicated from one sound Part of the Catholick Church, is excommunicated from all.* Page 7.

Whether this be upon the Supposition, that every sound Church is bound to ratify the Censures of another; and that he who divides from his Bishop's Altar, divides from a Mystical Head, answering to the Jewish High-Priest, as is taught by him from whom you borrow the Notion, *That Christianity is nothing but Mystical Judaism*; perhaps one may know hereafter.

But if a Man excommunicated from one sound Part, be, as you would have him, by consequence cut off from the whole Catholick Church, that Church to the Unity of which you say the *Influences of the Divine Spirit are confined*; to what purpose is your Distinction between a *Judicial Sentence*, and an *Act of a Man's own Choice*? Resol. of Cases of Consc. p. 48.
 For you suppose, the Man chuses that which justifies the Sentence. Letter to Anonymous, p. 7. And how can you say, you will not pretend to determine the *Final State of Men*? Whereas he who dies after such a Sentence, unrestored to the Church-Communion, dies in a Condition, as you tell us, depriv'd of all the *Influences of the Divine Spirit*, and consequently of all Means of Salvation. And 'tis but small Comfort for such a Man, that the Church did not design his Damnation, *Because the Church casts no Man out of a State of Salvation*; that this excludes them from a *State of Salvation*, is not the *Act of the Church*, but *God's Act*. Vid. Vindic. of the Def. p. 44. As if you should say, that when you cast an innocent Man out of your Ship, into the vast Ocean, where he is sure to perish; that this excludes the poor Wretch from the State of Life, is not your Act, but God's.

Truly, Sir, how much soever you may slight the way of asking Questions, I think it better to ask you, Whether you believe a Man, thus put out of the State of Salvation by God himself, can be sav'd of his own natural Power, without the Influence of the Divine Spirit, which it seems he is depriv'd of by a fallible Sentence? than to charge you with *Pelagianism*, when you think you determine nothing of the Man's *Final State*.

Letter to A-
1107. P. 7.

Homily, f. 109

But I am sure, Our Church teaches us, that, *It is the Holy-Ghost, and no other Thing, that doth quicken the Minds of Men, stirring up good and godly Motions in their Hearts, which are agreeable to the Will and Commandment of God, such as otherwise, of their own crooked and perverse Natures they should never have.*

Pag. 8.

Letter, p. 8.

The other Horn of my formidable Dilemma, as you slightly call it, you avoid with becoming Caution; and supposing it to be aim'd against all manner of Obligation to *Communion with this Church*, take not its real Force, which is, That if this Submission or Obedience be no part of the Divine Covenant, then it may so happen, that a Man living here may be a *Member of the Catholick Church, tho he is not in Communion with this sound Church*. To which you give not the least colourable Answer.

Letter, p. 8.

And I believe by this time you see, or at least, others will see, that the Supposition that he ought to communicate, if Communion may be had, is not to the Question, Whether this be part of the Divine Covenant, or no? For if it be part of the Divine Covenant, then I must confess, 'twill not be a sufficient Excuse, that the Submission is not neglected or contemn'd; for it ought to be actual, whatever be the Scruple; especially if the

the Thing enjoined be not unlawful in it self, tho it be in the Conscience of the Party.

But then to the Query, *Whether Dissenters may not* Letter, p. 9.
reply, that they are ready to communicate, if the Communion
be not clogg'd with some Things, which are no part of the
Divine Covenant ? You say, *The Reply is weak and im-*
pertinent, because Obedience in all lawful Things is in a large
Notion part of the Divine Covenant ; and the Supposition is,
of communicating where Communion may be had.

Now the Question being put of their scrupling the Lawfulness, I leave it to your self to consider, whether our Church does not condemn this Opinion as *Phari-*
saical.

3. The third Head or Query, which concerns the Letter to A. non. p. 9.
 Derivation of Church-Power from Christ himself, you
suppose not to belong to you.

But surely, at first sight, before one hears your lear-
 ned Answer, one would think it strange, how it should Letter, p. 45.
 come to pass, that you should admit the Dissenters to
 have full Church-Power amongst them; and yet charge
 them with Schism, for not communicating with us;
 while you suppose, that whoever communicates with
 them will be guilty of Schism.

Methinks Mr. D.'s Ground of charging them herein
 is much more plausible ; which is, That they are Schif-
 maticks in dividing from them, who derive all Church-
 Power within this Nation from our Saviour, and his
 Apostles, exclusively of all others. But pray, is the
 Church-Power in the hands of our Conformists, by rea-
 son of the Divine Law, or because of the Civil Law,
 which makes them the governing Part ?

If:

Vindicat. of
Dr. Stilling.
p. 4, & 5.

If it be by reason of the Divine Law, Mr. D. is in the right, notwithstanding all that you say against him. If it be by the Civil Law, then the Reason why I ought to communicate with Conformists, and not with Dissenters, is by reason of a Difference made by Human Laws. And then see if you can answer what you say against Mr. *Humphreys* his peaceable Design of uniting the Episcopal Men, Presbyterians, and Independents, under one Civil Government; where you say, *If the Evil and Sinfulness of Separation consisted only in Obedience to Humane Laws, I should think it a barbarous Thing to make any Laws, which shall ensnare Men in so great a Guilt.*

But in Answer to my Question,

Letter, p. 10.

You own that a Lay-man may preach the Gospel, where there is none of the Clergy. But since you here set aside the Question of the Derivation of Power from under our Saviour, and his Apostles, or from the Divine Law; how come dissenting Ministers to be Schismatics for preaching the Gospel? or they not to be Schismatics, who refuse to communicate with them, even where they require no Terms of Communion, not only not unlawful, but perhaps which are no way differing from what Christ himself requires?

Resol. of Ca-
ses, p. 7, 22.

Ibid. p. 42.

The first Query here was upon supposition, that you would in no case allow a Church to be gathered without a constant Succession of Church-Ministers; which tho you deny to follow from your Doctrine, is but the Consequence of many of your Assertions, particularly of these two: (1.) *That it is absurd to gather a Church out of a Church of baptized Christians, and divide Neighbour-Christians into distinct Communions.* (2.) *That there*

*there cannot be two distinct Churches, for distinct Commu-
nions, in one City or Nation.*

Taking it for granted, as I had reason, that you went
herein upon the Authority of the Church-Officers, I
ask'd,

Whether this would not put the Being of our Church
upon an hazardous Issue, and oblige your self to prove,
that 'twas a true Church before the Reformation?
Which surely is no remote Consequence from the Sup-
position that the *Church-Power* was lodged with them of
the *Church of Rome* before, in opposition to which our
Church was erected, and *out of which it was gathered.*

But then you say to my second Query upon this,
That there was not the same Necessity for private
Christians, reforming from an Antichristian Church, to
usurp the Ministry, as there is for a *Lay-man in an Heathen*
Nation.

Letter, p. 10.

But you do not observe, that the Force of this lies in
the Supposition, that the Power was lodg'd with the
Popish Clergy; upon which account the Acts of the
Reformed Ministry, in opposition to them, would be
but like the Acts of Lay-men.

And you know who has asserted,

That Recourse ought to be had to the Intention of the
Church-Governors, Ecclesiastical Power being their Gift:
And this does oblige all to a strict dependance on the supreme
visible Power, so as to leave no Place for Appeal concerning
the Practice of such Government: And they are the most
certain, as well as the most competent Judges of their own
Intentions.

Vid. Mr D's
Reply to
Mr. Baxter,
p 43, 81, 22.

But should we have recourse to such *Church-Gover-*
ners, pray do you think they would say, you have
Power of keeping up a Form of Church-Government
in

in opposition to theirs, or that your Officers are better than Lay-men? To put this home to you, I shall here subjoin a Passage of your own.

*Vil. Def. of
Dr Stuk. p. 369*

Should a Company of private Christians, on their own choice, separate themselves from their Bishops, and unite into a Church-Society, this were a Church-Faction and Schism, and all they did were null and void.

Here you must admit, that a Minister Episcopally ordained, may possibly join with them in this Separation from the Bishop; or else you will allow of what will overthrow your Assertion, as to Separation, even from the most sound Church.

Wherefore this being admitted, and it being laid generally, shew me, if you can, wherein this differs from Mr. D. at least, how Separation from Papists, or from whatever unlawful Terms of Communion, can upon your *Hypothesis* be freed from Schism.

Letter, p. 11.

You assure us, you do not charge our Dissenters with Schism, from the *Invalidity of their Orders*, but from their *causless and sinful Separation*. And tho they have *true Orders*, and are *true Churches*, but yet *divide Christian Communion*, by separating from any sound Part of the *Christian Church*, they are *Schismaticks*; nay, if it were only in separating from each other.

Wherefore since Separation, and ordinarily refusing to communicate where one never did, but as you suppose, ought, come to the same thing, you cannot blame me, if I represent your Notion to be, That where there are several Churches within a Nation, which here you admit of, whether one of these Churches has Authority over the Members of the other, or no; yet he who refuses to communicate with any one of these, is a *Schismatick*: And so you make it in relation to Churches in several Nations.

If this be your meaning, as I take it to be, then you have no reason to cry out of Mis-representation, and blending together Things of a different Nature, when I ask, Pag. 11.

Query 4. *Whether from the Supposition, that there is to be but one Church-Covenant throughout the Catholick Church, that there cannot be one true Church within another? And that the Nature of Catholick Communion is such, that one ought to be ready to communicate with any sound Church, from which one is not hindred by reason of the Distance of Place?*

Ibid.

It does not follow.

Here you stop me before you make an Answer, as if I did not fairly, to take every one of these Propositions for yours, or in tacking together some Things not very consistent with each other. Because you had in some place asserted, that there could be *but one Church in one Place*; therefore it seems, not only our Dissenters, but also Foreigners living here, are without any Church. Tho to avoid the Force of my Questions, now you would admit, that the Dissenters may have sufficient Church-Officers and Power, but however, that they are *Schismatics*, if it were only for dividing from each other. Pag. 12.

Answer to A.
non. p. 11.

You had said further, that nothing can justify the Distinction of Christians into several Churches, *but only such a Distance of Place, as makes it necessary and expedient to put them under the Conduct and Government of several Bishops.* Ibid. p. 12.

What that Distance of Place is, which makes this necessary and expedient, you are not pleased to inform us. But nothing, it seems, but Distance, can with you justify

Letter to Azo-
nym. p. 4.

a Distinction of Churches, be the Terms never so unlawful; which is but the same in effect with what you had said elsewhere, as that *'tis absurd to gather a Church out of a Church of baptized Christians*. Nay further, here is more wholesom Doctrine, which is, That no Distinction of Churches is justifiable, but under Bishops. Yet alas! you do not dispute against the Dissenters Form of Church-Government, or deny their being rightly invested with Church-Power, no, not you.

But it lies not upon me to reconcile you to your self; nor can you deny the having said a Thing in one place, because of the contrary in another.

The only Proposition which you can seem to deny with any colour, is, *That one ought to be ready to communicate with any sound Church, from which one is not hindered by distance of Place*. But surely 'tis full enough to this purpose, that,

Discourse con-
cerning Church
Communion,
p. 34, 15.

The Exercise of true Christian Communion in a particular Church, is nothing else but the Exercise of Catholick Communion in a particular Church, which the Necessity of Affairs requires, since all the Christians in the World cannot meet together for Acts of Worship. But there is nothing in all these Acts of Communion, which does more peculiarly unite us to such a particular Church, than to the whole Church.

Ibid. p. 26.

Again, To be in Communion with the Church, signifies to be a Member of it; and that not of any particular Church, as distinguish'd from the whole Catholick Church, but to be a Member of the one Body of Christ, and of every sound Part of it.

Wherefore as a Man is a Member of every sound Church, sure he may communicate with any sound Church, if Distance do not hinder; nay, the refusing
Communion

Communion in such Case, is the very Schism which you all along declaim against.

Having thus fix'd upon you every one of these Propositions, (for the first of them I cannot believe that you will yet deny.)

Viz. but one Church-Covenant.

I shall consider with you what follows.

Wherefore I still assert,

Either that the French Protestants have no Church here, but are Schismatics, in not communicating with ours ; Or that ours is guilty of Schism, in making the Terms of Communion so streight, that it is not the Duty of every one, tho a licensed Stranger, to communicate with this Church.

Three Letters, P. 13.

Now to avoid the Question here, you have a pretty Notion, whereby you would make French Protestants to have no Church, calling them an *Ecclesiastical Colony*, belonging to the Church abroad. But all Church-Power being exercised amongst themselves here, you have no more ground to call them an *Ecclesiastical Colony*, in respect of the French Church, than you may call ours so in respect of any other, to which we might have formerly belonged, especially since they cannot meet with the Mother-Church in *France*, for *Acts of Worship*; and therefore have your own allowed Distinction from that.

Resol. of Cases, p. 18.

But if these refuse to communicate with our Church, you make Schismatics of them, only excuse them, as being *exempted* from the *Jurisdiction* of this Church.

But this you condemn, as being contrary to the Practice of the *Primitive Church*; and besides, consider not what you said to Mr. *Humphreys* his Project; nor your charging the Dissenters with Schism, for not communicating with *each other*, notwithstanding that one cannot pretend Jurisdiction over the other; and so must

Letter to A. non. p. 14.

be in the same case with those that are priviledged or exempted.

Wherefore the French Protestants are beholden to you for a good Lift.

But taking it for granted, that 'tis the Duty of these French Protestants to communicate with our Church, when ever they are required, you take no notice of the Consequence from your Tenent, which is, that they ought notwithstanding an Exemption; for else it follows, that our Church is too streight in its Terms of Communion: And you cannot surely but remember where we are taught, *That Union to the Body consists in Union to that Part which is next.*

Windic. of the
Def. of Dr. Stil.
p. 360.

2. But I ask'd you further, Whether it does not follow, from the Obligation to communicate, or to be ready to communicate with any true Church, where Distance does not hinder, that a Member of the Church of *England* is not obliged to constant Communion with that Church, but may occasionally communicate with the French Church, nay, with Dissenters too, if he believes that any of their Congregations is a true Member of the Catholick Church.

Page 16.

Page 18.

Here I lie under your sore displeasure, for turning *your own Artillery* upon you. And you think, *No Man in his Wits ever understood this Question in any other Sence, than that whatever Church I can occasionally communicate with, I am also bound to communicate constantly with, whenever such Reasons as are necessary to determine my Communion to a particular Church, make it my Duty so to do.*

And a very doughty Question this is; for surely 'tis beyond dispute, that whatever necessarily determines my Communion to a particular sound Church, makes constant Communion with it my Duty; and is no more, than

than that what makes it my Duty, makes it my Duty. But the Question is, Whether any thing necessarily determines my Communion to a particular Church, and what it is? And thus I might leave you upon your Mistake of the Question. But,

I think 'tis demonstrable, from what you your self say, that the Place does not determine my Communion with a sound Church, no, not so much as ordinarily.

You distinguish between a State of Communion, and *Acts of Communion*: But unless a Man, tho he has sufficient Opportunities, may be in a State of Communion, without any actual Communion, I know not what is meant by saying, *No Act of Communion more peculiarly unites us to any particular Church, than to the whole Christian Church*; and that 'tis *no Interruption of our Communion with the Church of England, to communicate actually with any Church that is in Communion with it*: And yet a Member, as a Member, is in constant Communion.

Resol of Cas-
ses, pag. 15.

Letter, p. 15.

Perhaps indeed, if the Communion of Churches is suppos'd to be upon the Catholick essential Terms, actual Communion with a Church, which is in Communion with this, is no Interruption or Suspension of Communion with this.

But admit now, that the French Church, which you say is in Communion with ours, would be ready, if required, to hold communion with us in every Point wherein we may seem to differ, but yet should keep up their separate Meetings or Assemblies; and an English Protestant, believing that he may receive most Benefit from their Preachers, should never actually communicate with our Church, but always with that; would he be in a *State of Communion* with our Church, or no? And tho the Civil Power has made a Distinction of Parishes,

rites, and some other Places appointed or allowed by its Laws, in one of which it requires the Sacraments to be received at such and such times : If they receive not in any of these Places, will the receiving with the *French Church* justify them, and free them from the danger of being excommunicated as *Schismaticks* ? If it will not, as you must acknowledg, then either the French Church is not in communion with us, whereas you say, *they are in communion with us* ; or else communicating with a Church in communion with ours, is not a Communion with our Church.

Pag. 15.

Nay, and you say, that according to the Laws of Catholick Communion, *nothing but Distance of Place can suspend our Obligation to actual Communion.*

But if I may communicate with the French Church, as being in communion with us, then the Place does not determine even my ordinary presential or actual Communion to ours ; nor does it yet appear what does.

Pag. 20.

But you offer at it, when you tell us, 'tis *separate Power and Jurisdiction*, which determines this Matter ; but separate Communion would be *Schismatical*.

But still what Jurisdiction can there be to oblige me, contrary to the Terms of Catholick Communion, which (according to your own concession) will suffer me to wander ? Is it the Civil Power, as it unites us under a National Church ? Pray remember how you run Mr. *Humphreys* down, upon the Supposition that the Civil Power should take off the Obligation to Episcopal Communion.

Is it the Divine Right ? Pray consider Mr. *D.* again, and then you may think your self beholden to me, for bringing your Notions under the Protection of so ingenious a Person.

In the mean while be pleased to shew wherein you differ from him, when you suppose you have found a *National Church antecedent to any Human Authority.* Defence of Dr. S. p. 585.

For this is either as you make the Union of the Bishops to be the National Church, or the Union of the Clergy and Laity together. If you make it to consist in the Union of the Bishops, then certainly to make that *antecedent to Human Authority*, you must betake your self to *D—lism* ; at least, you have not yet invented any other way, tho a working Head may do Wonders.

If the Union be of Clergy and Laity together, then it is by Consent, which is Humane Contract or Agreement, and is the same with Humane Law, by you exploded.

And Consent, you say, is *all that is necessary to unite a Body or Society in one Communion.* Page 566, *supra.*

But then this Consent you hold to be *necessary by a Divine Law.* And here indeed is *Cardo rei.*

Well then, this Consent, which is necessary by a Divine Law, is either in Fundamentals only, or in Fundamentals and Accidentals too.

Whatever Church differs from a sound Church in Fundamentals, is certainly *ipso facto* cut off from Christ's Body, without Excommunication.

But the Question is, Whether if in Accidentals only the danger be the same ?

Dr. *Stillingsfleet* says, it is not ; and you have not yet proved it is. *Vid. Preface to the 3 Letters.*

Indeed you talk very wisely of the *Catholick Church, which is the Root and Fountain of Unity, and was antecedent to particular Churches.* *Vindic p. 24.*

But I would gladly know whether these Accidentals were antecedent too ; or whether it is not the Fountain of.

of Unity, only upon the account of the Fundamentals essential to it.

Speak home to this, and shame all the Orthodox Writers before you, and of this Age, if you please. Assure your self, my concern was only to admonish your self, and your unthinking Hearers, of the Danger I conceiv'd to lie in your way. If neither you will retract, nor they distrust your Authority, however I have discharg'd my self.

But it not being improper for me to make some Enquiry into the Political Constitution of a Church, *viz.* as it is founded on Consent, which, as was before cited, is *all that is necessary to unite a Body or Society into one Communion*. Here 'tis presumed, that the Consent of the *Minor* Part is so included in the *Major*, that every one is bound, as he would avoid the damnable Sin of *Schism*, to conform to that sound Church, or particular Way of Worship, which carries it by most Voices. But suppose, that according to Mr. *Humphreys* his Model, several Ways should be left indifferent; or that the Number of Voices should be equally divided; or where there are three Negatives, it could not be agreed by all three, dividing by a National Act from a false Way of Worship; which of the distinct Communion in the true Way should be the National? Would not more than one Church in such case be consistent with one Civil Government? And can it be made appear, which of these is the *Root and Fountain of Unity*, according to your Cabalistical Terms, to which the others ought to unite.

But suppose one of the Churches carries it by plurality of Votes, and looking upon all others as Schismatical, and therein as Heretical too, should, with the

African

African Fathers, deny these Schismatics, their Communion, unless they should be re-baptized, which you own to have been a *Mistake* in those Fathers: Pray, would they still continue Schismatics, who would refuse to come in upon those Terms? Or would the prevailing Party, which vigorously insisted on this, be Schismatical?

Vindic. of the
Defence, p. 14:

But as you say, that there ought to be but *one Church*, and *one Communion in one place*; and that *Dissenters are Schismatics in separating from each other, as well as from the Church of England, while they live in England*. I desire you to resolve me one Question; which is this.

Whether the Christian Church at Rome, gathered out of the Gentiles in the time of the Apostles, or that distinct Church which was gathered out of Jews, was the Church of the Place?

You will say, No doubt that the Church gathered from among the Gentiles, was the only sound Church. But what think you then of those poor Jews, who through the Misfortune of their Education were so wedded to the Jewish Rites, that they thought them necessary to be retained along with Christianity; which (as you do) probably they thought to be nothing else but *mystical Judaism*; and would not communicate in those Christian Congregations, which believed those Rites to be abolished by the Christian Religion?

Were these poor Men Schismatics, and as bad as *Murderers and Adulterers*?

If they were, they might well argue, that our Saviour introduced a very hard Law, which not only obliged them to a severer Mortification of their Appetites and Desires, but required of them upon pain of Damnation, to act against their Consciences in those very things which they scrupled, as they thought by Divine Warrant.

F

But

Dr Still. of the
Mischief of
Separ. p. 172.

But as to their Case, Dr. Stillingfleet tells us, that, *It was agreed by all the Governours of the Christian Church, that the Jewish Christians should be left to their own Liberty, out of respect to the Law of Moses, and out of regard to the Peace of the Christian Church, which might have been extremely hazarded, if the Apostles had presently set themselves against the observing the Jewish Customs among the Jews themselves.*

But if it had been absolutely necessary to Catholick-Communion that there should be but one Church in a place. The Apostles, who were the Governours, would never have suffer'd this: Which since they did, I conceive it directly conclusive against your Notion.

Nor is it to be suppos'd, that these Jews had no distinct Church-Officers. For Timothy might have been over a Church of converted Jews, being circumcis'd, which for ought we know was for that very end.

Gal. c. 2. 13.

vers. 14.

Nay, St. Peter himself *withdrew, and separated himself from the Gentiles*: And, as St. Paul told him, *would compel* (to wit, by his Example) *the Gentiles to live as do the Jews.*

But will you say, (as you must, if you are consistent with your self) that St. Peter was a Schismatick by this?

You say, *There cannot be any competition betwixt two Churches*; because there must be but *one in the same place.*

How far this agrees with the fore-going Instance, you would do well to consider.

pag. 16.

If in this matter I have fastened *many absurd Propositions* upon you, tis not, I conceive, for want of due regard of my *own Reputation*, or the *common Principles of Honesty*; you well know the old Observation, *uno dato absurdo sequuntur mille.*

As

5. As to my Query about virtual Baptism, you say, *You speak only of the necessity of visible Communion in visible Members*: And these you suppose not capable of Communion with the visible Church, not being made Members. But the Question is, Whether they be not made Members of the invisible? And if they be, your Notion, of the absolute necessity of being visibly received into Communion, falls.

6. As to that of a profest Atheist; you here place both him and a *Schismatick* in the same state of Exclusion from the Catholick Church. Yet it may be a Question, Whether by our unwary wording things, you do not suppose that the Atheist is intituled to Acts of Communion, but the Schismatick is not. The first you seem to suppose to be in a State of Covenant with God.

Answer to A-nonym. p. 21.

For a *Church-State* and a *Covenant-State* you make the same thing: And if it be not, or that Baptism does not give us this, you argue that, *then a Man may be in Covenant with God through Christ, and yet be no Member of Christ: or, he may be a Member of Christ, viz. as baptiz'd, and yet no Member of his Body, which is the Church.*

Resol. p. 6.

Nay, in your glorious Vindication, you number *Schismatics* among them who you say, *shall at the last day be judged, not as Infidels, but as wicked and Apostate Christians.*

7. The seventh Query, which goes upon that Ground (which you give, and do not yet recede from) for the Belief of your lodging Church-Power so with the Clergy, that they who conform not to them, or who incur their Displeasure, would be in a woful Case; you answer only with a Scoff; but say not whether the Clergy are the Church Representative, or whether what I urge would follow from that Supposition, or no.

Vindic. of the Defence of Dr. Still. p. 62.

Vid 3 Letters to the Dr. p. 8.

These were the general Questions; and whether most of them were *impertinent*, or are now fairly answered, 'tis for others to determine..

Letter to A-
non. p. 22.

From hence I am obliged to follow you to my three Sets of *Queries*, as you call them, relating to several Propositions and the *parting-blow of four Queries* relating to the Text.

Vid his Answer to Owen, in his Defence of the Discourse of the Knowledge of Christ, p. 107.

Because of my asking Questions concerning your Sense of our Saviour's Promise to his Apostles, which you seem to suppose to go along with Church-Governours in Succession, as distinguish'd from the Body of Christians, and without allowing private Christians that share which the Words of the Promise import; you intimate my designing to *confute our Saviour, and burlesque his Institution*.

But to use mostly your own Expressions, if my design of Charity, and to deliver that blessed Institution from the *Freaks of an Enthusiastick Fancy*, and to expound it to a plain and easy Sense, such as is agreeable to the Understanding of Men, and worthy of the Spirit of God, be to *burlesque Scripture*, I acknowledg the Charge.

To my first Question:

Whether our Saviour's Promise of Divine Assistance, did not extend to all the Members of the Church, considering every Man in his respective Station and Capacity, as well as to the Apostles as Church-Governours?

Letter to Anon.
p. 23.

You answer; That there are Promises which relate to the whole Church; and Promises which belong to particular Christians, as well as Promises which relate particularly to the Apostles and Governours of the Church.

Well, for the comfort of us poor Lay-men, there are some Promises which relate to us.

It being so, then I may well ask,

2. *Whether it signifies any thing to say, there is no Promise to particular Churches, provided there be to particular Persons, such as are in Charity with all Men, and are ready to communicate with any Church, which requires no more of them than what they conceive to be their Duty, according to the Divine Covenant ?*

You think it hard to *know what this Query means*. But surely 'tis material to know, whether or no such Men may be saved, otherwise than under Church-Governors. And truly you tell us pretty plainly, (I wish for your own sake, it had been a little more covert) that such have no Promises, but *as Members of the Church*, that is, of the visible Church, under Church-Officers, if you answer to the purpose. You add indeed, *When Communion may be had upon lawful Terms* ; I hope this implies, that 'tis possible the Terms may be unlawful.

Which yields me my fourth Question upon this Mat- *Vid. Query 4.*
ter. But it likewise yields, That if the Terms are unlawful, private Christians are entitled to these Promises, tho not visibly admitted into a Church-State ; which is contrary to what you all along drive at.

But it seems however, your Charity to these Men, who think the Terms such as they ought not to comply with, is so great, to believe them *guilty of Schism, as adhering* *Letter to A-*
to their own private Fancies, in opposition to Church-Authori- *nonymus, p. 24.*
ty, out of Pride and Opinionativeness ; which God alone can judg.

The

3. The third Query is, *Whether if the Promise you mention be confined to the Apostles, as Church-Governors, it will not exclude the Civil Power?*

Letter to A-
nonym. p. 24.

To which you answer, That the Civil and Ecclesiastical Power are *very distinct*, but *very consistent*. But such a Power in the Church-Officers, as would make them the *Church-Representative*, and prevent a National Reformation, tho by the Civil Power, is of another Nature. Nor do you think fit yet to declare, what the Power is which you would have lodged in Church-Officers.

But for fear you should go beyond your Warrant in this Matter, I shall mind you of what our Church teaches us, which is, that,

Homily con-
cerning the
Holy-Ghost,
f. 211.

We must not think, that this Comforter was either promised, or else given only to the Apostles, but to the Universal Church of Christ, dispersed through the whole World. And speaking of Christ's Promise, that the Spirit of Truth should abide with them for ever, and that he would be always with them; he meaneth, saith our Church, by Grace, Vertue and Power; and that (it says) was indifferently to all that should believe in him, through their (the Apostles) Words, that is, to wit, for his whole Church.

To my Inferences from the second Proposition, which I consider apart:

You make such an Answer, as if we had been at cross Purposes.

For my Questions were grounded upon your asserting, without any limitation, *That 'tis absurd to gather a Church out of a Church of Baptized Christians.* And indeed it is but a Golden Aphorism, wherein you epitomize

mize a great Part of your Discourses on this Subject.

And you answer, That the Independents are out in their way of gathering Churches; and that we separated not from the Papists upon their Principles. Which is nothing to the purpose. But you do confess indeed, that we may *separate from any Church of baptized Christians, if their Communion be sinful.*

Letter to A-
nonymus, p. 25.

But wherein the Difference lies, I know not; except by Separation, you would only have a withdrawing from Communion, but will not allow the setting up a distinct Church-Communion, be the Cause of withdrawing never so just. Which unless you mean, I hope you will be so ingenuous to confess, this was not so warily worded, and so sound as might have been. But if you have a Patent to make Words signify what you please, besides their natural and presumable Intendment, to make generals particular, or *vice versâ*, much good may it do you; provided they afford you not a Loop-hole for the most uncharitable Censures.

Vid. the Case
of indifferent
Things.

Yet give me leave, before I quit this, to demonstrate, that you have not answered fairly in restraining this, as if spoke only of *Independents*. These were your own Words:

When there is one Church within the Bowels of another, a new Church, gathered out of a Church already constituted, and formed into a distinct and separate Society; this divides Christian Communion, and is a notorious Schism. This is the plain case of the Presbyterian and Independent Churches, and those other Conventicles of Sectaries which are among us: They are Churches in a Church, Churches formed out of the National Church; by which means Christians, who live together, refuse to worship God in the same Assemblies.

Resol. of Ca-
ses of Consc.
p. 21:

Pray

Letter to Anonym. p. 46.

Pray, Sir, would you have me fancy some *general Scope and Design*, which no Man can *understand*, from the Words you utter in any particular Place.

This, I suppose, may satisfy reasonable Men, that all my Queries under this Head are not impertinent.

The third, which was still under the same Head, tho you would divide it, was this :

Whether, as in the Primitive Times, there was but one Bishop, and consequently one Church in a City, there are not now as many Churches within the National, as there are Bishopricks ?

To which you answer, *Every Bishoprick is a distinct Episcopal Church*. Well then, how does that agree with the Primitive Rule, from which in another place you had occasion to argue ?

And you know, to mention no more, *St. Ignatius*, who liv'd in the first Century, says,

S. Ignatius Ep.

Every Church has but one Altar, and one Bishop, with the College of Presbyters, and the Deacons ; which Bishop, the People, with the Magistrates, ἡ τῶ κλεισταει, nay, and Cæsar himself must obey. Now except you will make all the Bishops, and the Arch-Bishop of York, but Pastors to the Metropolitan of Canterbury, it may be a Question how that Rule would hold good here. And how will this correspond with what you say in the Book you would have your Notions tried by, where you say, *Every particular Bishop is the supreme Governour in his own Diocess ?* When, according to this, he would be but one of the College of Presbyters ? And that seems in your own Sense, to have been the Heresy or Schism of the *Novatians*, that they would pretend to a Bishop of

Defence of Dr. Stilling. p. 568.

Vid. Vindic. of the Def. p. 37.

of their own, independent upon him whom the Catholics supposed to have been lawfully possess'd of the Church. And you know in that case *Occupancy* is adjudg'd to be a good Title.

*Vid. Mr. D's
own Priest-
hood.*

But then you say, *Every Bishop has relation to the whole Christian Church, and is to take care of Neighbouring Churches*; and therefore those Bishops should govern their Churches by mutual Advice and Counsel.

*Def. of Dr. S:
p. 568.*

But suppose they will not, any more than one Prince will be governed by the Advice of his Neighbour; do not you make Independent Sovereigns of them? But admit the Civil Power should not interpose to the uniting of them.

4. Would not that which was the fourth Query prove to be not very impertinent?

Which is, *Whether it is more absurd that there should be Independent or Presbyterian Churches within the National, than that there should be so many Bishopricks.*

*Letter, p. 10.
Dr. p. 26.*

But further as the Primitive Fathers made Schism to be in a dividing from the Bishop; that is, as you will have it, were it only upon the account of Accidentals (tho St. Ignatius particularly goes upon a Schism, *ἁίρεσις*, Ignat. Ep. ad Phil. or dividing from Truth). How, even upon the Notion of dividing in Accidentals, will he that divides from one Bishop, but yet communicates with another, be guilty of Schism?

*Ignat. Ep. ad
Phil.*

5. And then my 5th Supposal, which you here admit, that the Independents or Presbyterians have among them sufficient Church-Officers and Power, as much as clears them from the Imputation of Schism, as it does that Bishop and his Flock, who will not be impos'd

G

upon

Vindic. of the
Defen. p. 433.

upon by his Neighbouring Bishop, but will have Rites and Ceremonies different from the other, and with which he expects that all should comply that communicate at his Altar. And if it be lawful for him to determine indifferent Circumstances and external Solemnities; you know, 'tis necessary to make them the Terms of Communion.

6. Then the 6th Query relates to the Charitableness of your Censure of such honest-minded Men, as communicate with them. Where you say, *Indeed you know not what Allowances Christ will make for the Mistakes of well-meaning Men.*

Vid. Pag.

Tho else-where, as I have shewn, you deprive them of all the means of Salvation.

Pag. 27.

The Queries upon your Supposition, that the Independents exclude themselves from Catholick Communion, by requiring of their Members a new Covenant, no part of the Baptismal Vow; I need not take any great pains to re-assert.

1. The first was, *Whether any Obstacle to Catholick-Communion brought in by Men, may not be a means of depriving Men of it, as well as Covenant or Contract.*

2. If it may, (which you do not deny) will you not upon this account make our Church more guilty than the Independants. *Baptism you own, is the only thing which admits into the Catholick Church; but they require no new Covenant at Baptism; ergo, they admit into the Church without any clog or hinderance of human Invention.*

Now you, who it seems have been better acquainted with the ways of Separation than I can pretend to, deny my Minor, and say that they baptize no Child but of
such

such Parents as were in Church-Covenant with them.

Having no time to be at present instructed in their way, I will admit all this to you, and will admit them faulty: But then the Question is, Whether your Argument will not equally concern our Church.

For it being put, as I do it just after, concerning an Adult Person that would be received to Baptism; he finds this *Rite of Admission instituted by our Church.*

Vid. *proved*
from Dr. Still.
Mischief of
Separat.

Upon which he scruples:

1. Whether the Rite of Admission into this Church being made necessary to his Admission into the Catholic Church, the Rite ought not to have been only of Divine Institution.

2. Whether the Canon declaring that 'tis used as a lawful outward Ceremony and honourable Badg, whereby the Infant is dedicated to the Service of him who died upon the Cross; there is not, according to the common and natural Intendment of the Words, as much Efficacy ascribed to this Rite as there is to Baptism it self, of which our Church Catechism hath it.

'Wherein I was made a Member of Christ, the Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Wherein, seems here of like Signification with whereby, and to be so taken by our Church, when it says;

'By holy Promises, with calling the Name of God to witness, we are made lively Members of Christ, when we profess his Religion, receiving the Sacrament of Baptism.'

Homily of
swearing, f. 47

Wherefore,

Quest. 1. Whether such a Man may not honestly scruple this?

2. Whether it ought to be made a Term of Communion to such an one?

3. Whether in such case the enjoying this under a Penalty would not sufficiently answer the end of Church-Government, without making it a Term of Communion, which you suppose necessary in every lawful Injunction.

Pag. 29.

But waving this, till you know my own Exceptions against the Sign of the Cross (which 'tis not likely I shall ever have occasion to except against upon my own account, or my Childs, since I think there can be no Magick in it to affect the Infant). You would avoid the Suspition of yielding to the like Accusation against our Church with that which you set up against the Independents, by this Distinction.

That the Independent Church is schismatical in its Constitution; for admit this *an unlawful and sinful Term of Communion*, yet, say you, *the Frame and essential Constitution of the Church is not Schismatical*.

But except you yield to me that a matter enjoy'd, tho it be not sinful in its own nature, may be so to the Party of whom 'tis required, and call this a *sinful Term* in that Respect: be pleas'd to consider again how a Church *commanding things sinful, and admitting none into Communion with it but upon those sinful Terms*, can avoid the Imputation of being Schismatical in its *Frame and essential Constitution*, any more than the Independents for requiring a new Church-Covenant.

If you say, the Church may quit those Terms, and still continue a sound Church: so may they and yet continue Independent.

But if I ought to learn my *Catechism* from our Church it self, rather than from any Doctor in it, I should think that

that wherever there is *any Congregation or Fellowship of* Homilies, f. 213
God's faithful and elect People, built upon the Foundation
of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the Head
Corner-stone; that must be such a Church as cannot pos-
 sibly differ in its essential Frame and Constitution from
 any other sound Church.

But when you say, *'Tis impossible that a Church, which*
is not Schismatical, should excommunicate Schismatically; *'tis*
 worth enquiring, whether you mean, That tho it
 does enjoin Terms sinful and unlawful in themselves,
 and excommunicate them who cannot comply in such
 Matters, it has, by that exercise of its Power of the
 Keys, deprived those Dissenters of Catholick Communi-
 on, as not being Schismatical in its essential Frame and
 Constitution.

Being excellent good at leaving out the Force of any
 Question, to which you are loth to give a direct Answer,
 you say, my three first Queries relating to the meaning
 of the Text, come onely to this,

Whether every particular Church may not be called the Body
of Christ?

Whereas it was, *Whether it might not be an entire Body?*
 And you yield my Question; yet you say, all the Chur-
 ches in the World are *but one Body, and must be but one*
Communion. Which if you will allow to be by virtue
 of a mystical or spiritual Union, need not be disputed.

Yet it being a Question, Whether you would yield
 a particular Church to be a proper Body of Christ;
 why might I not ask, Whether it may not at least be ta-
 ken so in a Metaphorical Sence?

And surely you, who have been charg'd to turn the
 Priesthood of our Saviour from proper into Metaphori-
 cal, might well enough understand what I meant by
 this Word.

*Vid. his Def.
 and Continu-
 ation, p. 119.*

But

But if you consider the Force of the Question upon the Text, it is to know your Warrant for arguing, that it is always Schism to refuse the Communion of any sound Church, where-ever you find it, whether it has Authority over you, or no; from a Text, which only charges Schism upon Members of the same particular Church, or Body of Christ, with which they did actually communicate.

For my 4th Query from the Text, of the Nature of Schism, you condemn me to the Drudgery of examining the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*: But as you speak not directly to it, I shall here take it for unanswered; yet I shall not deny it some Consideration in its due time.

But thus you say, you have *honestly answered* all my Queries in my first Letter: And truly the Judgment of Charity obliges me to hope that you have, according to the Intention of your own Mind. And yet 'tis a very difficult thing to believe, that you should not have discernment enough of your self, to see through all your false Colours.

If they are Errors of your Understanding, I hope God will not call you to so severe an Account for them, as you threaten to *well-meaning Dissenters*.

My second Letter you may, if you please, term *per-
vish*, for conjuring you, as a Protestant Divine, to answer my Doubts categorically, and that without referring me to what Mr. D. or any profest Papist had writ on that Subject. But perhaps very few Men, that observe the Neighbourhood of the Doctrines, through *Mediums* not far differing, leading to the like End, will much condemn the Caution which I there gave you.

Where-

Wherefore to vindicate my self to you, I shall give a taste of your Agreement with Popish *Medinms*. And since you disown *D—lism*, shall as much as conveniently may be, strip your Positions of what is directly his way.

And perhaps it will not seem improbable, that you should have borrowed some of those Arguments, which I look upon as tending to, or proceeding from Uncharitableness, from the Author of *Charity maintained by Catholics*.

His Labour is, to prove all Protestants Schismatics, because they withdrew from the Communion of the *visible Church*; that is, in his Sence, the Church of *Rome*, and those that were in Communion with her. And he cites *St. Austin*, to prove, That not a diverse Faith, but the divided Society of Communion doth make Schismatics: From whence he argues, 'That the Catholick or Universal Church is one Congregation or Company of Faithful People, and therefore implies not only Faith, to make them faithful Believers; but also Communion, or common Union, to make them one in Charity; which excludes Separation and Division.

Vide *Chillingworth*, cap. 5.

'He goes on: 'By the Definition of Schism may be inferred, that the Guilt thereof is contracted, not only by Division from the Universal Church, but also by a Separation from a particular Church or Diocess, which agrees with the Universal.

You would prove, That Men, as they would avoid the Sin of Schism, must communicate with the *National Church*, or with some Church that is in Communion with it, and reject the Communion of all other Parties and *Sects of Christians*.

Indeed.

Page 39.

Page 38.

Indeed you will say, that you qualify it, if the National Church be sound, that is, if there be *nothing sinful in its Constitution and Worship.*

Yet 'tis a Question, whether your Arguments go not as far as the Jesuit's.

For you suppose with him, that there must be some particular Church, with which we must communicate, under Church-Officers : Or, to use your own Words, *We must of necessity join in the actual and visible Communion of the Church.*

Reply, p. 34.

Reply, p. 22.

Pag. 23

Chillingworth
p. 265.

Suppose the Dissenters say, with Mr. Chillingworth, *We don't leave the Church, but only its external Communion ; You look upon that as absurd, and wonder that they should assign Reasons why they cannot communicate with us, and yet at the same time will not own that they have made any Separation.* Nay, you affirm, That for two Churches to renounce each others Communion, or at least, to *withdraw ordinary Communion from each other, from a profest Dislike, and yet still to continue in a State of Communion with one another, is a downright Contradiction.* Well, be it so, then it seems Protestants, by withdrawing from the Communion of the Romish Church, put themselves out of a State of Communion with the Christian Church, just as Dissenters do. Yet our great Champion thought he had furnish'd us with a *little Armour*, which might repel all the Jesuit's Batteries ; and could not understand it to be a Contradiction, to say, *One leaves the Church by ceasing to be a Member of it, by ceasing to have those Requisites which constitute a Man a Member of it, as Faith and Obedience : But we leave the external Communion of a Church, by refusing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies and Worship.*

What

What tho, according to Mr. *Chillingworth's* Rule, 'tis possible to be a Member of the Church without actual Communion? You say, 'Tis as necessary *actually to communicate* with some Church or other, as 'tis to *be a Christian*. Resol p. 30. Page 31.

Wherefore it seems those Protestants in Popish Countries, who did actually communicate with no Church, had not what essentially constituted them Christians.

You will say, that you make allowance for Cases of Necessity, when Communion cannot be had but upon sinful Terms: But surely 'tis absolutely necessary to *be a Christian*.

Nay, in that very Book which you refer me to, for your Thoughts at large, you assert from your own, and the Popish Notion of the Power of the Keys, that the *Communion of the Church is absolutely necessary to Salvation*. Vindicat. of Dr. Stilling. p. 116, 117.

Wherefore methinks many of your Expressions would make no improper Sound out of a Papist's Mouth.

We are the Visible or National Church; your Division from us is Schism, and Separation from the Church; and every Separation is a Schism on one side or other. Letter to A. Minnis p. 32. Vindic. of the Def. of Dr. Stilling. p. 6.

Nay, you renounce our Communion; for to withdraw your selves from ordinary Communion with the Church in which you live, into distinct and separate Societies for Worship, is to renounce their Communion. And, he who disputes the Authority, or destroys the Unity of the Church, renounces his Membership and Communion with it. Resol of Cases, pag. 21. Page 13,

Besides, 'tis enough that 'tis a Separation, and gathering a Church out of a Church, which did before consist of baptized Christians. Ye are Schismatics, in dividing your selves from the Body of Christians; and all your Prayers and Sacraments are not Acts of Christian Communion, but a Schismatical Combination. Page 7. page 17.

You may pretend, that if you do not divide upon the account of sinful Terms, yet you do it for greater Edification, and purer Ordinances: And that at least 'tis very doubtful, whether the Church on Earth has power of clogging God's Ordinances with such Rites, as shall be made Terms and Conditions of receiving them. page 44.

Well, 'tis no matter for all this: Doubt, and divide from us, and be damn'd. It's pleasant, that you should pretend

H

Edifi-

Letter to Anonymus, p. 26.

Resol. of Cases of Conscience, p. 5.

Letter to Anonymus, p. 30.

Page 30.

Edification, to break the Unity of the Church: Be assured, that the Influences of the Divine Spirit are confined to this Unity. What Allowances Christ will make for the Mistakes of well-meaning Men, who divide the Communion of the Church, I cannot determine; but his Mercies in such a Case are uncovenanted; and such an one is no Member of the Invisible Church, that we do or can know of. And if he separate from the Visible Church, tho upon the account of sinful Terms, the Thread of this Reasoning affords him no Clue to lead him to the Gate of Life: For having no visible Church that he knows of, with which to communicate; or by Misfortune being depriv'd of the Opportunity, he was thereby denied the ordinary Means of Salvation. And it may be said in your Words, I do not now speak of the invisible Operations of the Divine Spirit.

Truly, Sir, to my thinking, either I have rightly represented your Agreement here, or Words are to be governed by some Authority which you have not yet produced.

The *half Answer*, which you suppose already given to the Question, with which I closed my second Letter, had, I doubt not, its due Consideration, where-ever 'twas met with.

But the Question was this:

‘Whether if the Nature of Catholick Communion requires
‘a readiness to communicate with any sound Church; and yet a
‘Church obliges us to communicate with that alone, exclusive
‘of other sound Churches, while Distance does not hinder
‘the occasional and frequent Communion with others; is not
‘that Church guilty of Schism in such an Injunction, contrary
‘to the Nature of Catholick Communion?’

Your Answer is, *That no Church can be supposed to forbid Communion with any Church, which is in Communion with her.*

But 'tis its Duty to forbid Communion with *Schismatical Conventicles.*

Which is as much as to say, that the French, the Greek Church, or any other, that is not in Communion with our Church, is a *Schismatical Conventicle.*

And such you observe, that *I am pleased to call sound Churches*, wherein you intimate, *That no Church, which is not in Com-*

Communion with ours, that is, not ready actually to communicate in all its Accidentals, can be sound and Orthodox.

But then the frequent Communion with another Church being in the Question, what provision does your Answer make for so much as the *ordinary Communion*, which you call *constant*, with the National Church. But then you having admitted, that Dissenters have proper Church-Officers and Power, what Answer will you make to what follows? *Or at least, is it not impossible, that he who communicates sometimes with one true Church, sometimes with another, can be a Schismatick, or any more than an Offender against a positive Humane Law?* Letter to A. non. p 31.

You say indeed, he is an Offender against the Unity of the Church, and the Evangelical Laws of Catholick Communion; but you have not yet been pleased to produce those Evangelical Laws, which oblige Men upon the pain of Damnation, consequent upon Schism, to communicate with the Church-Officers allowed of by the Civil Power, rejecting others as Schismatical, tho admitted to have the same Evangelical Institution. Answer to A. non. p 31.

Indeed you look upon it as self-evident, 'That where-ever there is a Church establish'd by Publick Authority, if there be nothing sinful in its Constitution and Worship, we are bound to communicate with that Church, and to reject the Communion of all other Parties and Sects of Christians; for the Advantage always lies on the side of Authority.' Resol. of Cases of Consc. p. 38

But how this is made out by any thing you say, I cannot find.

In my Judgment you afford no other Notion of Catholick Communion, but as an Agreement and Readiness to communicate in Accidentals, as well as Essentials, with any sound Church, be it National or otherwise.

Indeed you suppose Dissenters to have no sound Church, for want of a National Establishment; but then you make no manner of provision for so much as the ordinary actual Communion in any Episcopal Church, where one lives, if so be that one communicates actually with any other Church which is in Communion with that.

But if it should happen, that the true Notion of Catholick Communion consists only in a Communion in Essentials, and being

Vindlic of the
Defence, p. 5:

being united by the Christian Bond of Charity, notwithstanding Separations for lesser Matters; then by the same reason I may communicate with any sound Church, and nothing but Humane Law can restrain me, which, by your own Confession, can neither make nor cure a Schism.

And indeed what should hinder, but that Humane Law may as well confine me to the Communion of the Bishop of the Diocese where I live, which you know were but according to the old Rule, of *One Altar, one Bishop*; as well as to give me a Latitude for any Diocese, provided I do not straggle into a Church, which is not in Communion with our Bishops? This Confinement to one Bishop, you must say, upon your grounds, would be contrary to the Nature of *Catholick Communion*; but we have your Authority for it, that the other is not.

Yet it seems, if Presbytery should have the Advantage of Authority, they who refuse Communion with the National Church, upon pretence of purer Ordinances, and the Belief that Episcopacy is the Ordinance of God, must be as bad as *Murderers* and *Adulterers*, that is, very Schismaticks.

Ibid.

And judg you, whether 'twould not be a *barbarous Thing* to make any Laws, which shall ensnare Men in so great a Guilt.

Vid Preface
to the 3 Let-
ters.

But here you take notice of a Passage or two in my Preface: The one, *That perhaps it is no Absurdity to suppose, that Men may as well continue Members of the National Church, notwithstanding their breaking many positive Laws, made for the outward management and ordering of it, tho not fundamental and necessary to its Being*; as he who incurs the Penalty of any Statute of the Realm about Civil Affairs, may however be a sound Member of the State, if he keep from Treason, or other Capital Crimes.

This you answer by a begging, and indeed mistaking the Question, and will have it of a *Schismatical Separation*, which you elsewhere expresse by *renouncing Communion*.

And this you may compare to Treason and Rebellion in the State, if you think fit. But the Church is not much beholden to you, for making that in which Conformity is expected, *fundamental and necessary to its Being*. And when you compare a Man that communicates sometimes with one true Church, sometimes with another, to a Man that joins sometimes with his Prince's

Prince's Forces, and sometimes with his Enemies; the Comparison is either very impertinent, or very uncharitable, in supposing that a Church, which differs from this in what is really accidental, how essential soever you make it, is Antichristian, or an Enemy to Christ, which surely no true Church is; yet I must confess, herein you agree with your self, when you say, There may be a *true Church*, which is no *Catholick Church*, that is, no true part of the Catholick Church. Vindice p 70.

I add;

Nay, possibly, that there should be several Religious Assemblies, living by different Customs and Rules, and yet continuing Members of the National Church, is not more inconsistent, than that particular Places should have their particular Customs and By-Laws, distinct from the Common-Law of the Land, without making a distinct Government.

This you condemn, without vouchsafing it a fair Hearing, as nibbling at that *Healing Project*, for which you think you have sufficiently exposed Mr. *Humphreys*. But I shall chuse the Protection of the great Protestant Champion, Mr. *Chillingworth*; and if you are resolved to wound him through my Side, I will bear the Brunt of it as well as I can. Letter to Dr. *Ham* p. 32.

‘To reduce Christians to Unity, there are but two Ways that may be conceived probable: The one, by taking away Diversity of Opinions touching Matters of Religion; the other, by shewing that the Diversity of Opinions, which is among the several Sects of Christians, ought to be no Hindrance to their Unity in Communion. *Chillingworth*, ed. anno 1664, f. 187.

The first he looks on as not likely, without a Miracle.

‘What then remains, says he, but that the other way must be taken, and Christians must be taught to set an higher value upon those high Points of Faith and Obedience, wherein they agree, than upon Matters of less moment, wherein they differ; and understand, that Agreement in those ought to be more effectual to join them in *one Communion*, than their Difference in other Things of less moment to divide them.

‘When I say, *One Communion*, I mean, in a common Profession of those Articles of Faith wherein all consent, a joint Worship of God after such a way as all esteem lawful; and a mutual

mutual Performance of all those Works of Charity, which
 'Christians owe one unto another.

'And to such a Communion, what better Inducement could
 'be thought of, than to demonstrate, that what was univer-
 'sally believed of all Christians, if it were joined with a Love
 'of Truth, and holy Obedience, was sufficient to bring Men
 'to Heaven : For why should Men be more rigid than God ?
 'Why should any Error exclude any Man from the Churches
 'Communion, which will not deprive him of eternal Sal-
 'vation ?

Letter to A-
 non. p. 50.

To the same Sence is the Passage I had in that Preface cited
 out of Dr. Tillotson's Sermon ; and you may as well ask him,
 as me, *Is the Catholick Church then, and Communion of Saints, no
 part of our Creed ?*

Your Notion of Communion is a new Article.

pag. 33.

But to re-assert what I had observed of your managing the
 Charge of Schism.

Refol. of Ca-
 ses, p. 47.

I had said, People might not well understand what it is, un-
 less it be taken to *lie wholly in want of Charity* : And in the
Errata, to avoid the Cavil of its being *common, such as we have
 for all Mankind*, I had added the Epithete of *Christian*.

I say further, to my thinking, as St. Paul speaks of it : He
 supposes a continuance still of the same Body, and ascribes
 it to Christians, continuing such, nay, and communicating
 with each other.

1 Cor. I. 10.

And this you were not able to deny ; nay, you well know,
 that not only the Thing, but the very Word, *ἁγισματά*, had
 by that Apostle been applied to such.

Letter to A-
 non. p. 33.

Hence you would argue, *That I will not allow causeless Sepa-
 ration from a sound Part of the Catholick Church to be Schism, but
 place Schism wholly in want of Charity.*

But 'tis obvious, that I do it no more than the Apostle him-
 self does.

But besides, it induces the Belief, that Schism is not such a
 Crime as you imagine : For if the *Corinthians* were Schisma-
 ticks, whilst they continued in Communion with each other,
 and yet were *particular Members of Christ's Body* ; then Schism
 does

does not cut off from Christ's Body, nor do you rightly apply the Addition of *Apostate Christian*.

Further, by what Authority do you apply that to a refusing Communion with any sound Church whatever, upon your supposed Notion of Catholick Communion, from a Text which mentions no other Schism, but what was between them who liv'd in the same Communion?

And still, beyond all this, it seems demonstrable from the Text, that the *Causa formalis*, or that which constitutes Schism, is not Separation, tho it be causless, unless it be accompanied with want of Charity.

For since there may be Schism, where there is no Separation of Communion, then it must be something which consists with joint Communion; and find out something, besides Want of Charity, if you can.

The Apostle's Notion of Schism we have seen; but I wonder by what Authority you affirm'd, *That Schism is nothing else but a Breach of Christian Communion; and that where the Unity of the Church is broken by distinct and opposite Communions, there is the full Nature of Schism; and where this is not, there is either no Schism, or only a partial Schism, which is like a great Wound in the Arm, which does not sever it from the Body. 'Tis not every Quarrel or Contention, (agreeably to your Notion, you might add, tho it be such as the Apostle calls Schism) which makes a Schism; but the Breach of Christian Communion.*

Defence of
Dr. S. p. 59.
Ibid. p. 60.

Let me desire you to consider, whether, by departing from the Scripture-Account of this, misled perhaps by the Disputes of some of the Ancients, thundring against each other, you will not enter at least into the Confines of *Donatism*. You say of those Hereticks, *They confined the Church of Christ to Africa, and to their own Communion.*

Defence of
Dr. S. p. 61.

Mr. *Chillingworth* gives us a fuller Account wherein their Heresy lay, in these Words:

That upon a vain Pretence of the Corruption of the Church, they separated themselves from the Communion of other Parts of the Church; and that they required it as a necessary Condition to make a Man a Member of the Church, that he should be of their Communion, and divide himself from all other Communions, from which they were divided.

It.

Vindic. of the
Defence, p. 70.

It seems according to them, to use your Words, *Tho a Church retained the Purity of the Faith and Worship, and was so far true; yet it was not every way sound and Orthodox, nor a Catholick Church, unless it observ'd those Conditions of Catholick Communion, which were two:*

1. That it must be in Communion with theirs.
2. That it must divide from all other Communions, from which they are divided.

Ibid. p. 51.

1. For the first, you teach us, that,
The visible Union of all Churches in and to Christ, consists in their visible Communion with each other, and Communion with a particular Church, which is it self in Catholick Communion, is as necessary as Communion with the Catholick Church.

Ibid. p. 59.

Letter to A-
nonym. p. 7.

Whoever lives in England, and renounces Communion with the Church of England, is a Schismatick from the Catholick Church.

Refol. p. 29.

And if occasionally we communicate with some other sound Part of the Catholick Church, in the same Communion, we may do it without Schism, so this be as owning our selves Members.

Refol. p. 23.

But an ordinary withdrawing upon a profest Dislike, you make as destructive of a State of Communion, as a formal Renunciation. Wherefore, as you hold, that we are bound to maintain Communion with all sound Parts of the Catholick Church, and that in other Matters, besides the Agreement in all the Articles of Faith, and Essentials of Worship; it does follow, that it must be in those very Matters which distinguish one Communion from another. And the National Church being that sound Part, wherewith every Christian here is to communicate, herein you have found out a Root, Fountain, and Principle of Union, or Beginning of the Catholick Church, to which all particular Churches are, or ought to be united, and by virtue of this Catholick Unity, *are one Catholick Church.*

Vindic. of the
Defen. p. 23.

Ibid. p. 26.

Refol. of Ca-
ses, p. 27.

If it be ask'd, What 'tis which brings one with safety to this Beginning of the Catholick Church? 'Tis not humane Law, as it has plac'd us under such a Government and Discipline, and which makes the only Distinction of Churches, you allow of; but the Principles of Catholick Communion, against which whatever Church offends, you will not yield it to be sound and
Orthodox

Orthodox. And you assure us, *We have nothing else to do, but to* Resol. p. 19.
judg whether that part of the Church wherein we live, be so found
and Orthodox, that we may communicate with it according to the
Principles of Catholick Communion: If it be, we are bound to
communicate with it, under peril of Schism from the Catholick
Church, if we do not.

And consequently, whatever Church refuses our Communion,
 'tis not *found and Orthodox*, or any part of the Catholick
 Church, as not retaining the true Principles of Catholick Com-
 munion. Thus far *Donatus* might have gone, taking it for
 granted, that his Church was the *Beginning of the Catholick*
Church.

2. This first Point being settled, 'tis no wonder if it be like-
 wise required, that we must divide from the Communion of
 all that are divided from this found part of the Catholick
 Church. And methinks *Donatus* himself might argue, That
 'tis evident the pretended Catholics understand not the true
 Principles of Catholicism; for if they did, they would never
 proffer a Composition with us, and yield that the surviving
 Bishop should govern these, which are now distinct Communi-
 ons: They must own, either that they are not any part of
 Christ's Body, or else that we are not; for 'tis impossible, that
 two Churches, which are not in Communion with each other, can both
 belong to the same Body. And therefore the Obligation to Catho-
 lick Communion, does equally oblige us to renounce the Communion of
 Schismatics. Answer to A-
nonym. p. 45.

You in effect justify *Donatus* his Terms of Communion; and
 when you say, *Their Churches were in all Things like the Catholick*
Churches, excepting Catholick Communion, you as good as tell Vindic. p. 70.
 us, he only mistook the Church, which he should have made
 the *Beginning of the Catholick Church*. If he had been with
 St. *Austin*, he had been no Heretick, for refusing to receive
 Hereticks into the Church without Re-baptization, and dam-
 ning all that were of a Communion divided from his, or that
 would not consent to have them excommunicated, who with-
 out proof had been accused of being Traditors.

But as you teach us, that that Church is not found, which
 keeps not to the Principles of Catholick Communion;

Mr. *Chillingworth* shews, wherein they swerv'd from that sound Principle :

Chillingworth
f. 151.

The Condition of their Communion (says he) *was both unnecessary, and unlawful to be required; and therefore the exacting of it was directly opposite to the Churches Catholicism.*

Def. of Dr. S.
p. 60.

For ought yet appears, *Donatus* and you are pretty well agreed in the Notion of Catholick Communion, and of the Breach of this Unity, wherein we are taught that the *full Nature of Schism lies*. He, with you, confin'd the *Influences of the Holy Spirit to this Unity*.

Yet whether he would have intreagu'd this Business of Church-Communion, as you have done, I cannot tell. All the Sence which I can gather out of your Notion, as the Leaf-Gold is spread out, is this :

That to be a Member of the Christian Church, and in a State of Communion with it, 'tis not enough to be admitted into the Church by Baptism, nor to exercise any Acts of Communion with a particular Church, unless it be in Communion with every sound part of the Christian Church, and that so, as to own your self for a Member of every such sound Church. And tho you do own your self a Member, as perhaps every one will that agrees in Essentials; yet if you ordinarily withdraw from that sound Church where you are, which must always be the only sound Church on the Place, upon any profest Dislike, or communicate with them that are of a divided, and consequently a Schismatical Communion, you forfeit your Membership, even tho that other Church has *nothing sinful in its Communion*: Which in one place, you think enough to *make any Church sound and Orthodox*; whereas in others, it serves your purpose to have it believed, that it cannot be *sound and Orthodox*, unless it maintain Communion in Accidentals with every other sound Part.

Refol. p. 43.

Upon the erecting this Scheme, and observing the Rules of Art you have already given, one may be able to resolve a great many nice horary Questions: Yet some of them must stay for your own Solution, or *Elias's*.

Quest

Quest. If Baptism lets one into the Church, and entitles one to all the Privileges of Church-Membership, how comes it to pass, that one who ordinarily dissents, is an *Intruder*, when he exercises an Act of Communion?

Resol. of Cases, p. 12.

Ans. You had your Answer already, if you had Eyes to see it: *He who despises the Authority, or destroys the Unity of the Church, renounces his Membership and Communion with it.*

Answer to A-
non. p. 33.
Resol. p. 13.

Quest. What tho he does actually communicate?

Resp. Yes, thou Man of perverse Understanding; *Church-Communion does not consist in particular Acts of Communion, but in Membership.*

Answer, p. 17.
Resol. p. 13.

Quest. Well then, if neither Baptism, nor particular Acts of Communion, are enough to make, or at least continue me a Member; pray how many Acts of Communion will do the Business?

Resp. Why, I tell you, it must be constant Communion.

Quest. What do you mean by constant Communion?

Resp. I mean *ordinary Communion*, that is, always some-
times. Page 19.

Quest. Well, what is it that obliges me always sometimes to communicate with a particular Church? Does Baptism do it?

Resp. No, we know *no Church, but all Christians are made Members of by Baptism.* Page 7.

Quest. What then, if I chuse ordinarily to communicate with another Church?

Resp. *If you divide your self from this Body, and set up distinct and separate Societies, which you call Churches, but which are not Members, nor live in Communion with the one Catholick Church, you cannot carry your Right and Title to the Covenant, out of the Church with you.* Page 9.

Quest. But do you not tell us, that *our Communion with the Church consists in being Members of the Church, which we are made by Baptism*: And they being baptized into the same Faith, I should think they hold Communion with the Church? Page 11.

Resp. But let me tell you, tho sometimes I maintain, *That Baptism makes us Members of the whole Church, and gives us a Right to communicate with every sound part of it*; yet in spite of Contradiction, I hold, *That Baptism at most gives Men only a* Page 12.

Kindie. of the
Def. p 6.

Resol. p. 38.

Resol. p 9.

Disposition to be Church-Members, but does not make them Members of any Church. Besides, where there are two separate Churches, one, if not both, must be Schismatical. And the National Church having the Advantage of Authority, you are bound to reject the Communion of all other Parties and Sects of Christians, as Schismatical: If you do not, you renounce your Membership, and by destroying the Unity of the Church, forfeit your Interest in the Divine Charter, and cannot carry your Right and Title to the Covenant out of the Church with you.

Quest. Suppose I do not communicate with any other Church, yet ordinarily withdraw from Communion with yours, at the Times appointed for Worship, or other Acts of Communion; is it enough to own my self a Member? Or if not, how long Suspension will amount to a Forfeiture?

Resol. p 35.

Resp. 'Tis not enough to own your self a Member; for to withdraw from the visible Communion of the Church, is Separation. Now if Separation from Religious Assemblies, be to break Communion; then to live in Communion with the Church, requires our actual Communion.

Quest. Well then, thus far I have learnt my Catechism, that there must be actual Communion, and that actual Communion must be constant or ordinary; otherwise a Man wilfully separates himself, and forfeits his Interest in the Divine Charter.

So it seems, tho Acts of Communion are but Effects and Applications of Church-membership, yet the Non-user of them forfeits the Right one had by Baptism, even tho one be not cast out of the Church by any Sentence; and nothing but ordinary Communion amounts to owning a Membership. How many Acts are necessary to avoid the Forfeiture, we are yet to learn.

Resol. p. 14, 15.

Letter to A-
non. p. 16.

And further, if we live where Communion may be had with another Church, in communion with that which expects our constant Attendance, we as well own our selves Members by a constant Communion with the other, as with that: For, as you inform us, there is nothing in Baptism, nor in all the Acts of Communion, which does more peculiarly unite us to such a particular Church, than to the whole Christian Church: And 'tis no Interruption of Communion to communicate actually with any Church, that

that is in Communion with another sound Part.

But if it should fall out, that notwithstanding the Division of Communions upon lesser Matters, a divided Communion may continue a sound part of the *Christian Church*, the Necessity of constant Communion with a Church, where occasional is lawful, will stand in need of some other *Medium* to support it.

Resp. O but there is a difference between being a Member of the *Universal Church*, and of all particular Churches, which are Parts and Members of the *Universal Church*. Answer to A-
n. n. p. 18.

Quest. Why so? may I not communicate with any sound Part, which is in communion with this Church, and professing no dislike of its Communion, thereby own my self a Member, especially since my communicating with the one, does not interrupt the Communion with the other; and neither Baptism, nor all the Acts of Communion, unite me more to one than another?

Resp. I care not for that, for constant Communion in a particular Church, confines Church-Membership to that particular Church in which you communicate. Ibid. p. 19.

Quest. If I may not offend, I should say my Question is, What obliges to constant Communion? But you seem to say no more, than that constant Communion obliges to constant Communion; or in your own Phrase, confines Church-Membership to that particular Church.

So it seems, if constant Communion be omitted, that Obligation or Confinement ceases.

I shall trouble you but with one Question more in this place; and that is, Whether the Necessity of re-baptizing those who were of a separate Communion, does not follow upon your Grounds, as well as upon *Donatus's*, and that tho the Party had not been baptized in a Schism? Certainly this is no remote consequence from the Supposition, that Separation makes a forfeiture of all the Privileges acquired by Baptism: For if they were forfeited, how can they be restor'd without a new Grant? Nay, they are your own Words, that the guilty *Divider* forfeits his Interest in the Covenant, without a new Grant. Resol. of Ca-
ses, p. 8.

But

But a little to examine the Foundation of your charitable Positions.

You suppose, that Christ's Body being but one, whoever separates from any sound Part, separates from the whole.

Vindic. of the
Def. p. 70.

But is it not equally evident, that whoever separates from any *true* Part, separates from the whole? Surely a true Member is a Member, tho it be not sound. Yet you say, there may be a *true Church*, tho no *Catholick Church*; that is, according to your Argument, no part of the *Catholick Church*. Is Christ's Body made up only of sound Members? Are all that are unsound, divided from the Body? But if a true Member be of the Body, as well as that which is sound, do not you, by refusing to communicate with any true Member, upon your own Principles, refuse to be of the Body; especially when the only Unsoundness is, that it differs by reason of some Accidentals, from that Church where you exercise the Acts of *Catholick Communion*? And it might be well to know, whether you own that there is any sound Church, besides the Church of *England*, with which you can communicate, how much soever you talk of *Catholick Communion*? Or at least, whether you are not Schismatical, in dividing from some true Churches? And may not you be charged with *denying the very Notion of a Catholick Church, and asserting that Christ has not one, but twenty, or a hundred several Bodies*?

Def. of Dr. Sr.
p. 139.

But whereas you affirm, that he who divides from one sound Part, divides from all: is it not rather demonstrable, that he who communicates with one sound Part, or one true Part, communicates with all, as being united to Christ's Body? As he that touches a Man's Finger, touches his Body; but it does not follow, that one cannot touch his Body, unless he touch his Finger.

But since you are so fond of this Notion, give me leave to turn your own Artillery upon you; and if you have condemned your self, or the Church in which you live, of Schism, and dividing from Christ's Body, you may thank your self.

If

If it follows from the Identity of Christ's Body, that whoever is divided from any sound Member, is divided from the whole, being that Member is united to the Body; so it must necessarily be, if you divide from any true Member, unless a true Member is no Member.

And you your self being sensible of this, have taught, that 'tis *absurd to gather a Church out of a Christian Church, and divide Neighbour-Christians into distinct Communions.* Nay, you left your self no possible Evasion, when you affirmed, that *the only thing that can give us in particular a Right to the Blessings of the Covenant, is, that we observe the Conditions of this Covenant, and live in Unity and Communion with all true Christian Churches in the World.* Resol. p. 22.
Ibid. p. 10.
Resol. p. 16.

If therefore there be any *true Christian Church*, with which you refuse to communicate, have you not made a good Rod for your own Back?

The *Church of Rome*, as you own, is a *true, tho a corrupt Church*; but you, I suppose, refuse to communicate with this *true Church*; are you not therefore cut off from Christ's Body? Answer to A.
m. p. 10.

You will say perhaps, you cannot communicate but upon sinful Terms: But what's that to the purpose? If this is still a *true Church*, and Member of *Christ's Body*, you know *Christ has but one Body, one Spouse, one Flock, one Church: And if we be no Members of this one Church, we are not united to Christ.* Ibid. p. 50.

The Parts of this Body must be united to each other, that they may be united to Christ; else it would be as if the *Parts of the natural Body should divide from each other, and hang together by a magical kind of Union with the Soul.* Ibid. p. 48.

And *Union to the Body consists in being united to that part of the Body which is next.*

You have foreclosed your self from saying, that you are united in what is essential to its being a Member of Christ's Body, and have a participation of the same vital Heat, and animal Spirits; but think it hard, that one Member should be charged with the putrid Sores or Wounds of another; and to speak plainly, that you forsake it only in its Uncatholick Terms.

Terms. This would come too nigh that very Fanaticism which you deride.

Vindic. of the Defen. p. 396. And you having told us, that a *Compliance with the Order, Government, Discipline, and Worship, as well as the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, is absolutely necessary to Catholick Communion.* 'Tis upon your own Grounds necessary to comply with every true part of the *Catholick Church* in all these, as well as with every sound Part.

Wherefore might not the Papists beat you into their Church, with those Weapons which you have forg'd against others?

Vindic. p. 90. Might not they tell you, that you want *Christian Charity*, unless you are united in one Communion with this *one Body*?
Ibid. p. 91. That you want the *chief Branch of Holiness*, without which none shall see God; That all the Blessings of the Gospel are promised to us in a Church-State; That the Effects and Application of the Grace, Merit, and Satisfaction of Christ Jesus is confined to this

Ibid. p. 100. Body, (consisting of Members sound and unsound); That the Gospel-Covenant is confin'd to the Communion of the Christian Church; That to remit Sins, is to restore Men to the Peace and Communion of the Church; and to retain them, is to cast Men out of the Church, or keep them under Church-Censures; which is a plain Demonstration, that Sins are forgiven only in the Communion of the Church.

page 104. But yet further, 'tis a Question, whether you are in Communion even with every Church, which requires nothing sinful as a Term of its Communion, and is upon that account sound and Orthodox?
page 177.

Refol. p. 43. You say indeed, you should make *no scruple to communicate with the Lutheran Church*, if it did not require of you the Belief of *Consubstantiation*: Yet certainly you did not attend to your own Grounds, when you said so.

Vindic. of the Defen. p. 725. For if that be not in Communion with our Church, you know you would be a Schismatick, if you communicated with it.

Refol. p. 25. But that their Church is not in Communion with ours, appears upon your own Rule, for that the *Governors are not in Communion with each other*, which you make essential to the Communion of particular Churches.

And for this 'tis not necessary to shew, that the Governors of each side *condemn the others Constitution*: 'Tis enough if the Governors of that Church which you are of, do condemn the *Constitution of the other*, or of any part of it.

You say indeed, that *our Church is so far from condemning Foreign Reformed Churches for the want of Bishops, that it has always lived in Communion with them.* Vindic. of the Def. P. 396.

If this be so, then as a *Bishop in the same Communion with us, might, with the leave of English Bishops, exercise his Episcopal Office in any Church in England*; so might a Protestant Minister ordained abroad without Episcopal Ordination. But I take it, you will not say, that he may: If he may not, this is a condemning with a witness: For if any of them have no Orders amongst them, where is their regular Church-Society? Nay, as you believe the *Right of Episcopal Government*, 'tis questionable, whether you do *Divine* not deny that such have any proper Church-Officers. Ibid. p. 148. Page 338.

And further, that you may not take the Difference about the *Constitution of Churches*, or the Validity of a particular kind of Ordination, to be merely between the Bishops of our Church, and the Presbyters of another; I take leave to inform you, that the *Stat. 14. of this King, cap. 4.* has provided, that every Person which was not then in holy Orders, by *Episcopal Ordination*, or should not be so ordained before a Day prefixt, should be *utterly disabled*, and *ipso facto depriv'd* from all manner of *Ecclesiastical Promotions*; and that none for the future should be admitted to any such *Promotion*, nor should *presume to consecrate and administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, unless *Episcopally* ordained.

The Penalty indeed is not made to extend to Foreigners of Reformed Churches allowed here; but quere, whether the Declaration of Disability does not?

If you say, by the *Lutheran Church*, you mean only those religious Societies of *Lutherans*, which are in *Sweden and Denmark*, under Bishops, or at least, that have *Superintendents or Generals*, ordained and ordaining *Episcopally*, which surely some *Lutheran Societies* want: you may avoid the Consequence, as to such, and all others of the Reformation, which are without *Episcopal Orders*, by denying them to be Christian Churches, Defence of Dr. S. p. 332.

'selves we be divided? *There is but one Faith*; and how can
 'we then say, He is of the Old Faith, and he is of the New
 'Faith? *There is but one Baptism*; and then shall not all they
 'which be baptized be one? Contention causeth Division;
 'wherefore it ought not to be among Christians, whom one
 'Faith and Baptism joineth in an Unity.

If all Differences in Opinions be here forbid, as cutting Men
 off from Christ's Body, it may be said perhaps, that Schism
 cannot possibly be avoided. But what seems intended by the
 Apostles, and by our Church, is, That notwithstanding such
 Differences, Men should be united in the same Faith, by the
 Bond of Charity, which you may call a *magical Union*, when
 Men divide from each other in their Opinions, if you please.
 Certain it is, neither the Scriptures, nor our Church speak of
 dividing Communion; yet there is no doubt, but that may be
 Schism in a divided Communion, which is in a joint. And who-
 ever want true *Christian Charity*, they are the Schismatics,
 whether in communion with a Visible Church, or withdrawing
 from it.

Having shewn what Account the Scriptures and our Church
 give of Schism; it may not be improper to shew in what sense
 it has been taken, by some of the greatest Eminency in our
 Church.

Vid. Mr. Hales
of Eaton his
Tract of
Schism, in his
Remains, edit.
Anno 1673.

I had before shewn, how Dr. *Stillingsfleet* had defended our
 Church against the Imputation of Schism, in dividing Commu-
 nion from the Papists; and how the Primitive Fathers ought
 to be understood, when they write of this; That Schism did
 not lie in a *voluntary Departure out of any particular Church, upon*
the account of any Thing extrinsecal and accidental: (*Christian*
Charity, to be sure, is essential.)

Vid. Prefaced
to the 3 Let-
ters.

I shall only subjoin the Testimony of Mr. *Hooker*; and if I
 have these two on my side, I shall think my self sufficiently
 well back'd.

The Apostle affirmeth plainly (saith he) of all Men *Christian*,
 that be they Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, they are all incorpora-
 ted into one Company, they all make but one Body; the Unity of
 which visible Body and Church of Christ consisteth in that Unifor-
 mity, which all several Persons thereunto belonging have, by reason
 of

Eccles. Polit.
f. 83.

of that one Lord, whose Servants they all profess themselves; that one Faith, which they all acknowledg; that one Baptism, wherewith they are all initiated. The Visible Church of Christ is therefore one, in outward Profession of those Things, which supernaturally appertain to the very Essence of Christianity, and are necessarily required in every particular Man. Let all the House of Israel know for certain, saith Peter, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, even this Jesus whom ye have crucified. Christians therefore they are not, which call not him their Master and Lord.

Answer to A-
non, 1711, p. 5.

But this extraordinary Person could not think himself obliged in Charity to his own Soul, and to deliver himself from the Guilt of the Blood of Dissenters, to instruct them in the Necessity of one Communion in Accidentals, if they would continue Christians: Nay, he thought, that altho they should be excommunicated, yet even that could not cut them off from Christ's Body. His Words are these:

Eccles. Polir.
f. 88.

As for the Act of Excommunication, it neither shutteth out from the Mystical, nor clean from the Visible Church, but only from Fellowship with the Visible in Holy Duties.

Def. of Dr. St.
p. 208.

But you, it seems, have considered this Matter better than Mr. Hooker, and affirm, *That every Bishop and Presbyter shuts out of the Catholick Church by Excommunication.*

Vid 3 Letters
p. 18, 23.

And this leads me to the Notion of a true or sound Church. And surely it was not impertinent for me to desire you to define what you meant by it, when considered as Catholick and Universal, when in a more restrained Sence, seeing, as I had shewn, you seem to have no other Idea of it, but as particular, visible, nay, and that national too; or at least, as being the only true Church within the Nation or City where one resides.

Letter to Anon.
p. 34.

Here I shew'd, that you applied that to the Visible National Church, which belongs to the Invisible, as well as Visible Church; where it lay not upon me to prove that the Influences and Operations of the Holy Spirit are not confined to the Visible Church: 'Twas enough to have shewn, that you had no ground for what you had said from the Text, which will not bear that restraint.

And the same thing is obvious of what you call my Attempt to prove Congregational Churches, from 1 Cor. 14. 23. For how can you prove, that one ought to communicate with the National

National Church and not communicate with any other Congregation, from what proves no more than that you ought to meet in some publick Place of Worship, even according to your own Argument in the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, which is no beter than to argue, that because you must go to some Church, therefore you must to this.

Not being concern'd for *Congregational Churches* more than others, I should not give my self the trouble to examine what you say against them, did not you oblige me to a small Diversion to observe how wonderfully you prove that it is *De. of Dr. Stil.* very plain that the Apostle in 1 Cor. cap. 14. means no more but P. 393. that all the Members of the Church do worship God in the publick Assembly of the Church, tho not all in the same Assembly and Congregation; where to oppose aright, you should have made it [in those publick Assemblies which meet together in one place] for there is no doubt but successive Assemblies must be meant, or else there could be no Provision for more than one Meeting, and then how can you, without begging the Question, maintain that when the Women are commanded to keep silence in the Churches, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, it might not be spoke of several successive Assemblies still in one place?

Nor are you more happy in encountring the difficulty upon *Ibid. p. 394.* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ.

You say indeed, it is very plain that it does not always signify one place.

And who says it does, when Circumstances determine it another way: but how can you affirm it to be so here without still begging the Question?

For your purpose you instance in *Acts 4. 26, 27. The Kings of the Earth stood up, and the Rulers were gathered together,* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, *against the Lord and against his Christ, &c.* Συνήχθησαν.

This you say well, signifies no more than an Agreement and Conspiracy in one Design.

But would not the most proper Inference from this Quotation be that as a Conspiracy may by a Figure be called a Meeting together, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, therefore tis not to be proved from that Text which prohibits a forsaking the assembling together, that those who live in a Church need actually to assemble together;

ther; but if they agree in the same Lord, the same Faith, the same Baptism, they may be said to gather together ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ.

You cite another Text, *Acts 2. 44.* *And all that believed were together* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ; 'tis in the Greek, ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ: indeed this signifies no more then that they were together, and being together may be granted not to refer to their religious Assemblies, but their common Abode: but what is this to εἶναι ἐν συνέλει ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ;

1 Cor. 5 v. 14. If therefore the whole Church come together, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, where one would think ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ is not added for nothing, but must signify the same place. And to my thinking there is another Passage in this Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which regards them as a Church that used to assemble together in one place, which is where the Apostle directs them to excommunicate a notorious Sinner συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τὸ ἐμὸ πνεῦμα.

When ye are met together, and my Spirit, &c.

Do you think that there was any need of a Miracle to pronounce the Sentence of Excommunication and that it must be done in the very same moment in distant Congregations?

I may be bold to say, that neither Scripture nor the Homilies take notice of your fancied Catholick or National Communion.

If you say that what we find in the Homilies to this purpose, being spoke in a Church already constituted, must relate to the present Constitution; so may it be said of the Apostle's Exhortation to that Church to which he wrote, which for ought yet appears, was a single Independent Congregation.

Yet it may be a Question, whether such Limitation can be supposed to have been intended in the following Words, which you may read in the Homilies.

Hom. for repairing to churches.

Churches are not destitute of Promises, for as much as our Saviour Christ saith, *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst among them.* A great number therefore coming to Church together in the Name of Christ, have there, (that is to say, in their Church) their God and Saviour Christ Jesus present among the Congregation of his faithful People, by his Grace, by his Favour and
godly

‘godly Assistance, according to his most and comfortable
‘Promise.

‘Now, concerning the Place where the People of God
‘ought to resort together, and where especially they ought
‘to celebrate and sanctify the Sabbath-Day, that Place is
‘called *the Temple or Church*, because *the Company or Congrega-*
‘*tion of God’s People, which is properly called the Church, doth*
‘*there assemble themselves.* The holy Patriarchs for a great
‘Number of Years had neither *Temple nor Church* to resort
‘unto. In the time of Christ and his Apostles there were no
‘Temples nor Churches for Christian Men; for why, they
‘were always, or for the most part, in Persecution, Vexation, and
‘Trouble, *so that there could be no Liberty nor Licence obtained*
‘*for that purpose; yet God delighted much that they should often*
‘*resort together in one Place, &c.*

*Hom. of the
place and time
of Prayer, fol.
126.*

Dr. Stilling.

Ibid. p. 127.

But then speaking of the building of Churches afterwards,
it says, *And to these Temples have Christians customably used to
resort, &c.*

‘True it is that the chief and special Temples of God wherein he
‘hath greatest Pleasure, and most delighteth to dwell, are the Bodies
‘and Minds of true Christians, and the chosen People of God, ac-
‘cording to the Doctrine of Holy Scriptures, &c.

Ibid.

‘Yet this notwithstanding, God doth allow the material Temple
‘made with Lime and Stone, &c.

Fol. 120.

How far this agrees with your Notion, That such Temples
of God cease to be so, if they are divided from, or shut out of
these material Temples, I cannot see; nor how you have
brought your Notion of a Church into Conformity with the
19th Article, which I before mentioned, but you thought fit
to slight, as not worth your Notice.

*Vid. Pref to
3 Letters.*

And therefore ’tis not likely that the Homiles should be any
more regarded.

Yet however it may not be amiss to mind you of what our
Homilies teach us of a sound or true Church. The Passage
before cited proves, that a particular *Company or Congregation*
of God’s People is the Church in proper speaking. And then for
the Catholick visible Church, we have its Definition or De-
scription in these words.

‘The

Hom. f. 213.

‘ The true Church is an Universal Congregation or Fellowship of God’s Faithful elect People, built upon *the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, Jesus himself being the Head Corner-Stone. And it has always three Rules or Marks whereby it is known. (1.) Pure and sound Doctrine. (2.) The Sacraments ministred according to Christ’s Holy Institution. And, (3.) The right use of Ecclesiastical Discipline.

9th Article.

These Notes tho ascribed to all in general, are manifestly to be applied respectively to select Congregations, or Fellowships of Christians : For ’tis not possible that all can be joyned in actual Communion. But in these things they are to be ready to communicate with each other as if they were one entire Body, in the first without any Limitation ; in the two last as the Church says of the Sacraments, *in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.*

Homilies.

And to prevent all affected Ignorance of our Churches Sense in this particular, it assures us that *Christ makes Intercession not only for himself and his Apostles, but indifferently for all them that believe in him through their Words, that is to wit, for his whole Church.*

I leave it to you run to the Parallel between what the Church teaches, and what you would impose on us in this matter. I shall not repeat the Particulars, but shall only observe upon your Notion of Discipline.

Vindic. of
Dr. Still. p. 116.

1. That according to you the Power of the Keys is absolute in Church-men’s Hands, from whose Power of binding and loosing you infer, that *Church-Communion is absolutely necessary to Salvation.*

Hom. f. 213.

Whereas our Church says,
Christ ordained the Authority of the Keys to excommunicate notorious Sinners, and to absolve them that are truly penitent.

Resol. of Cases,
pag. 6.

2. And secondly, Whereas you affirm, *That every profess’d Christian, who is received into the Church by Baptism, is a Church-Member ; and all Church-Members have a common Right to Church-Priviledges : That teaches otherwise.*

Pag. 10.

Hom. of the
Sacram. f. 205.

‘ *Why, says it, cryed the Deacon in the Primitive Church, if any be holy let him draw near ? Why did they celebrate these*
‘ *Mysteries*

‘Mysteries the Quire-door being shut? Why were the publick
 ‘Penitents and Learners in Religion, commanded to avoid;
 ‘Was it not because this Table received no unholy, unclean,
 ‘or sinful Guests?

And this it enforces from the Example of our Blessed Saviour, and the conforming Practice of the Primitive Church in these words:

‘According to this Example of our Saviour Christ, in the
 ‘Primitive Church, which was most holy and godly, and in
 ‘the which due Discipline with Severity was used against the
 ‘wicked, open Offenders were not suffered once to enter into
 ‘the House of the Lord, nor admitted to Common-Prayer,
 ‘and the use of the holy Sacraments with other true Christi-
 ‘ans, untill they had done open Penance before the whole
 ‘Church.

*Homily of the
 right use of the
 Church, f. 9.*

Here I might well leave you to bethink your self of returning into the Bosom of our Church, after you have divided from the Unity of its Doctrine. And I might advise you to have a care of contending too eagerly in the maintaining your own Opinions, for fear of running into the Formality of that which you take such pains to fright others from. Tho it may be a good way to convert *Schismatics*, to convince them of the Errour of their Ways, yet even that may be done schismatically, at least the causless Imputation of it may return upon the forward Censurer. Pag. 51.

But lest you should think I say this to avoid the notice of my shameful Baffle in the Story of Pope *Victor*, which you will have to be a *feigned Case*, told me by some body. Pag. 36.

Be it known to you, that the Authority which I had next at hand was a late learned Chronologist; who has these words; *Romana Ecclesia Episcopus fuit Victor. qui ab Anno Christi 192 sedit Annos 10, in Concilio statuit ut Pascha semper die Dominica celebraretur, atq; adeo excommunicavit omnes Episcopos & Ecclesias in Asia quae eadem die Pascha non celebrabant.* *Hen. Gutherb
p. 235.*

Here I might as well think that the Bishop pronounc'd the Sentence of Excommunication in Council, as he alone is said *statuere*, what was done by common Consent; and so we know *Rex statuit* is often used.

L

The

The Excommunication you contend to have been only his own Act, not the Act of the Council. And you cite *Eusebius*, which calls that, which I should take for an Exemplification of the Act of the Council, his Letter.

*Socrat. lib. 5.
f. 695.*

I am sure *Socrates* his Expression of this favours me, when he says, ἀπομνησίων ἀπέστειλεν, he sent them the Sentence of Excommunication. And the matter having been agreed on in a Council at *Rome*, where he presided, 'tis certainly most probable that this was not of his own Head,

Nor is it in the least any Argument against me, that other Bishops in Communion with him resented it ill: Being those other Bishops, *Irenaeus* particularly, were not at that Council: For, as *Eusebius* himself shews, as *Victor* presided at *Rome*, *Irenaeus* did in *France*.

*Antigonus P 2-
læologus.*

So that those of the same Communion were only such as agreed in that Doctrine of the account of time; about which I shall not dispute whether Arithmetick was concern'd or no: Yet I find it a long while since, by an old Emperour, called *Questio temporis non Fidei*.

Letter, p. 36.

But I find not in *Eusebius* that *Irenaeus* prevented this from taking effect, as you affirm; for the Sentence was actually pronounc'd, as both *Eusebius* and *Socrates* inform us. But when retracted, or whether at all, appears not.

But be it as you contend, that this was only the Act of a Schismatical Bishop; how comes it to pass that his Church was not concerned in this?

*Cyprian, lib. 4.
Ep. 9.
Ignat. Ep. ad
Philadelph.*

St. Cyprian says, *Qui cum Episcopo non sunt in Ecclesiâ non sunt*. And *St. Ignatius*, ὅσοι χεῖρς εἰσὶν ἑτοί κ' μετὰ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ εἰσιν. Both agree that there's no being in the Church, or in Christ, unless they side with their Bishop.

*One Priest-
hood, one Al-
tar, p. 253.*

And a Gentleman whose Authority I hope you will not except against, says of *St. Cyprian*;

'He makes all Bishops equal, to have the whole Power in *Solidum*, to be absolute Judges of their own Acts, and be accountable to none but God.

Resol. p. 25.

Nay you your self have told us that it is essential to the Communion of particular Churches that their Governours should be in Communion with each other.

Where

Wherefore the *Asian* and *Latine* Churches were in a State of Separation, and the Laity of one side or other were necessitated to communicate in a Schism.

This, Sir, may supersede my enquiry into your Niceties upon a Case of your own making.

But the same which you suppose *Victor's* to have been, you say, *was the Case of St. Chrysostom, and Epiphanius, and some other Bishops in those Days, who separated from each other: as Mr. Chillingworth has it of them, Divers times it hath happen'd, as in the Case of St. Chrysostom and Epiphanius, that particular Men, and particular Churches, have, upon an overvalued Difference, either renounced Communion mutually, or one of them separated from the other. Herein you agree with that great Champion, that however they maintained Communion with the Catholick Church.*

Resol. p. 43

Chillingworth
f. 255.

Letter to A-
nonym. p. 42.

Yet how that is possible upon your grounds, I cannot imagine.

But it seems poor *Tertullian*, and his Followers, were not worth your Pity, and you would not vouchsafe them a taste of your Skill.

Vid. Preface
to 3 Letters.

I should think upon your own Principles, since two Churches, which *are not in Communion with each other, cannot both belong to the same Body, or the one Catholick Church; that the Bishops, with their Followers, on the one side or other, were extra Ecclesiam foris.*

Answer to A-
nonym. p. 45.

The Contradiction which I charged you with, about occasional and constant Communion, you would avoid, by affirming, that you no where assert, that the *Communion of the Church does not make us Members of any particular Church, you having added [as such]: These Words I find elsewhere explained by [as distinguish'd from the Universal Church.] And a little before you had said, that this Membership may extend to the remotest Part of the World, if the Body whereof we are Members, reach so far. This I think comes up to what I urg'd, which I find no reason to retract.*

Letter to A-
non. p. 45.
Three Letters,
p. 16.

Page 46,
Page 14.
Vid. 3 Letters,
p. 25, 26.

I had produced *Mr. Chillingworth* to prove, that it may happen, that one is not obliged so much as sometimes to communi-

Letter to A-
nonym. p. 47.

cate with a sound Part of the Catholick Church, because you live where there is such an one.

And this, because such a sound Church may impose upon you the Belief of some Error, not destructive of the Faith, or some unnecessary Conditions of Communion, if not unlawful.

And you Sarcastically call me a subtil Arguer, for calling such a Church sound; as if it might not however be sound in its Vitals, and such an one as our Homilies would call a true Church.

Surely you do not consider what Advantage you give Dissenters in this.

But however, a Man of your Parts knows how to bring himself off in any case. And methinks 'tis a wonderful Instance of your Art, that what Mr. Chillingworth says, in opposition to the Necessity of communicating with a corrupt Church, having all the Face of Authority; and that however Christ may have a visible true Church on Earth, a Company of Men professing so much as was necessary to Salvation; should be turned into his meaning a formed and visible Church-Society, and pleading for the corrupt Church, when he was justifying the Separation of private Christians.

Letter to A.
n. n. p. 48.

When I had said, that if our Church required Conformity to its Rites and Ceremonies, as necessary to Salvation, it could not blame Men for dividing from it; you say, The Church could and would blame Men in such case; and whether you do not put the Church in Christ's stead, may be worth a Thought.

Ibid. p. 51.

The last Passage in my Letters, which you thought worth your Notice, was this:

Answer to A.
n. n. p. 51.

He who tells us, or he says nothing, that the Divine Spirit confines his Influences to the Unity of the Church in such Conformity, not only makes such Conformity necessary to Salvation, but imputes to the Church the Damnation of many thousands of Souls, who might expect to be saved upon other Terms.

I am persuaded, that there are very few of our Orthodox Clergy, that will not concur with me in this; and think, that whoever makes such Conformity necessary to Salvation, and will affirm, that our Church warrants him in so doing, brings the greatest Reproach upon it, and gives the greatest Advantage to Sepa-

Separation imaginable; and therefore will be far from thinking that he encourages the Dissenters in their Non-communication with us, who removes so great a Bar to an entire Communion.

Before the Book of Common-Prayer, there is a Declaration, the Authority of which I hope you will not dispute, which is, *That some Ceremonies are retained in our Church, for a Discipline and Order, which upon just Causes may be altered and changed, and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with God's Laws.* Where I take it, the Reason why they are not to be esteemed equal with God's Laws, is not merely because of their Mutability, for God's own positive Laws have been changed; but because they are enjoined only for *Discipline and Order*, some Determination of which may be necessary to Government, tho not to Christianity. This (I conceive) may be a good Warrant for the above-mentioned Remark.

To serve which, as you did that of the Divine Covenant, you would have it spoke in relation to those that live elsewhere in any part of the World: But as to them who live here, to whom the Subject Matter related, you do own, that *Subjection to Church-Authority in all lawful Things*, (that is, such Conformity) is necessary to the Unity of the Church, and necessary to Salvation. Answer to A. non. p. 52.

Tho some may not know what *Idea* to form of the Church of England, distinct from other sound Churches, but as incorporated with the State, and relying on a Civil Sanction; you cautiously confine this Question to *Church-Authority*.

Wherefore, admitting that our Bishops have possession of the Churches by a Right antecedent to any Humane Authority, and consequently may exercise Episcopal Jurisdiction within their respective Diocesses without any such Authority. Defence of Dr. S. p. 585.

What will you say to that Statute, which enacts, *That all Archbishops and Bishops of this Realm, or any of the King's Dominions, consecrated, and at this present time taken and reputed for Archbishops and Bishops, may, by Authority of this present Parliament, and not by virtue of any Provision, or other Foreign Authority, &c. keep, enjoy, and retain their Archbishopricks, and Bishopricks, in as large and ample manner, as if they had been promoted,* 28 Hen. 8. cap. 16.

promoted, elected, confirmed, and consecrated, according to the due Course of the Laws of this Realm. Was this impertinent, or presumptuous?

But as that very Act permits them to minister, use, and exercise all and every Thing and Things, pertaining to the Office or Order of an Archbishop and Bishop.

Mat. 28. 20.

Quere, Whether our Saviour himself did not set the utmost Bounds of their Power, when having commissioned his Apostles to teach all Nations, baptizing them, he adds, as it were by way of necessary Caution, teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you.

How extensive soever the Civil Power is, it may be a Question from hence, What Right they who claim to be lawful Successors to the Apostles, have to command Things not forbid by Christ, without being tied up to his positive Institutions? And how comes it to pass, that they who are entred into Christ's Church by Baptism, and continue in the Profession of his pure Religion, should be Schismatics, and cut off from his Body, merely for disobeying Additions, the Authority of which they soberly dispute?

Answer to Answer. p. 32.

You say, in one part of your Answer to me, That whatever Variety and Difference in the Rules of Worship, is consistent with one Communion, may be granted, when the Prudence of Governours sees it fit and expedient.

Ibid. p. 40.

Where as you condemn such Indulgence, as is inconsistent with one Communion, it may be thought to be equally conclusive against the Imposition of any Thing inconsistent with one Communion, or the great Law of Catholick Communion. And when you confess, that the Government of the Church since the Apostles Days, was never so entirely in the Bishop's Breast, that what he did should be thought the Act of the Church, any further than he complied with those Laws, by which the Church was to be governed. You having likewise set aside the Civil Authority, and admitted that Dissenters have sufficient Church-Power amongst them, I again ask, How they can be Schismatics for dividing from the Bishops, upon the account of suspected Rites and Ceremonies, which they believe not to agree with those Laws by which the Church was to be governed, as being greatly prejudicial to, if not inconsistent with one Communion?

Ibid. p. 4.

And

And I would willingly be satisfied, how you can bring within the foregoing Rules, what you assert but within three Pages, where having held, that there was no Schism between the Latin and Asian Churches, yet you will have it, that private Christians at Rome, could not receive the Asians into the Communion of the Church, without the Bishop's Authority. Answer, p 40.

But to word this Matter according to your Hypothesis; Tho Conformity to the Church of England, that is, Obedience to the Church-Governours, the Bishops, is not essential to the Unity of the Catholick Church; yet it is for all that live here. Ibid. p. 51.

I should have been contented to have the Controversy confin'd to Persons living here, but that you tempt me further.

You say indeed, That Christians, who live under the Government and Jurisdiction of other Churches, may, and do preserve the Unity of the Church, without Conformity to the Church of England. Ibid. p. 52.

But pray, can they preserve the Unity of the Church, without Catholick Communion, to which, as you have told us, a Compliance with the Order, Government, Discipline, and Worship, as well as the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, is absolutely necessary? And then, All the Churches of the World are but one Church, or one Society, and have the same Right or Obligation of them to communicate with each other, as Opportunity serves, in all those Duties, for the sake of which Christian Churches are instituted, as the Members of a particular Church are. Vindic. of the Defen. p. 396. Ibid. p. 36.

There are some other Passages in my third Letter, which perhaps might want to have something said to them; but I shall only refer the Whole, with what I have here wrote, to your second and cooler Thoughts. But I must confess, I wonder how I escap'd unrebuk'd, when I observ'd, that you your self made a sufficient Excuse for some even causeless Separation. And if the Sinfulness of Separation lies in not observing your Terms of Catholick Communion, the Dissenters would think themselves pretty safe under Mr. Chillingworth's Defence against the Papists, not only when he affirms, That the Gospel of Christ is the whole Covenant between God and Man; nor when he blames the Papists for making Salvation depend on Things casual. Chillingworth, f. 56. Ibid. p. 79.

casual, and in the Power of Man to confer, or not to confer.

Chillingworth
f. 91.

But if it were only because of the Obscurity and Doubtfulness, if not Inconsistency of the Grounds, whence the Obligation to constant Communion with the Church is inferr'd; for he thought it Demonstration, that *nothing is necessary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed.*

Letter to A-
nonymus, p. 5.

Now, Sir, I take leave to tell you, that I have faithfully followed you in all your subtil Windings; I am sure I have nowhere *perverted* your Discourses, how much soever I may have mistaken them. And 'tis no easy matter to take his Sence rightly, who is inconsistent with himself.

It has not been the least, nor perhaps the least pertinent part of my Task, to fix your own Principles upon you; some of which need no other Exposure, but to be set in their proper Light, where, like the *Cadmæan* Issue, they may be left to destroy each other.

Answer to A-
non. p. 46.

If you forget in one place, what serv'd your purpose in another, or go to prove too little, or too much, for what possibly might be your *general Scope and Design*; I hope you will for the future be more cautious of condemning Men for *Dishonesty*, in arguing upon what they find.

By this time 'tis likely I may in a double Sence have tir'd your *Patience*, which you value your self upon. I must confess, the Substance of what lies in Dispute between us, might be brought into a much narrower Compass. But perhaps it was no more than requisite, to put several Questions to you, to prevent all colourable Evasion, that one might take up what might be artfully slipt over upon another.

And certainly, any one that observes what Skill you use in the management of this Controversy, will think that many Things, which might have seem'd superfluous, were but necessary to oblige you to speak out.

3d Letter to
Dr. S. p. 18.

Thus when I had ask'd, *Whether a Man has a Right to be of a particular Church, as he is a Christian, that is, (as I then thought, and still do) a true Member of the Catholick Church; I should not have added, [Or becomes a Christian, only as received into a particular Church]* were it not that I wrote to one who

who seems to think no Man can be a true Member of the Catholick Church, before he has been actually receiv'd into some particular Church. But you, taking no notice of the last Branch of the Question, wonder I should ask you, *Whether a Man has a Right to be of a particular Church, as he is a Christian?* when you say, *The whole Design of your Tract is, to prove that every Christian, by being so, is a Member of the Catholick Church, and has a Right to communicate with all sound Parts of the Catholick Church, and bound to communicate with that Part of it in which he lives.*

Answer to A-
nonymus, p. 34.

Now 'tis odds, but it may be as evident upon this *your whole Design*, that every particular Church is bound to receive every Christian, as such, into its Communion, without imposing any Terms but meer Christianity; as that a Christian must communicate with that sound Part where he lives, even in other Terms.

Yet here you speak not one Word to the Question, how a Man becomes a Christian, whether it be *only as received into a particular Church*: Indeed you had said in your *Resolutions*, which I thought you might have either justified or retracted, That *no Man can be in Covenant with God, or a Member of his Church, who is not at least visibly admitted*, which must be by some particular Church; and surely no Man can be a Christian, who is not in Covenant with God: Wherefore, according to you, no Man can be a Christian, before he has been received into a particular Church.

Resol. p. 5.

Nay, further; either *every Christian, as such, has not a Right to communicate with all sound Parts of the Catholick Church*; or else he who is excommunicated, tho for a wrongful Cause, ceases to be a Christian.

But alas! *Sir*, it were endless to insist upon all the Advantages which I might take from your Assertions, assure your self, I have not wittingly shun'd the Encounter of any Thing, that might look like an Argument for you; many Things have had a particular Consideration, meerly as they were yours.

And since for a more large Account of your exterminating *Hypothesis*, you directed me to certain oracular Writings, formerly publish'd, I was willing to be at a little pains to pick

Def. of Dr. Stil.
& Vindic.

out the choicest Flowers from every Place, and having sorted them together, to present you with a Nosegay out of your own Garden ; you know even the same Flowers yield some variety of Scent, according to their different sortings.

Aliud agendo.

Finding (which before I was ignorant of) that your Sermons were but the Gleanings of those Notions, which you have been cultivating for some Years ; I have not the Vanity to believe that I should, by the mispending a few Hours, oblige you to condemn them, and the Books out of which they were extracted, for waste Paper.

Wherefore all that I can now expect, besides the undeceiving some, and provoking others to lay your Errors more convincingly before you, is, to have fairly rid my hands of this Controversy, in which I shall not willingly engage further.

However, if press'd to it, I shall not decline the Honour, as far as my mean Abilities, and many Avocations will permit, to vindicate the Catholick Doctrine of our sound and Orthodox Church, from such Misrepresentations on this Point, as tend to the giving Men ill Impressions concerning it. And what I have already done, perhaps may not appear more to answer the Obligation of Christian Charity to Dissenters, than of Gratitude to that indulgent Mother, which requires nothing of me, but what I can chearfully and readily obey.

Let Men teach no other Doctrine but what that warrants ; and very few at least will be likely to stray for better Edification.

Sure I am, 'tis not the Thundering of Damnation against Men, that convinces them, tho it may fright them out of their Wits. They may listen to mild Instruction, from one that not only preaches up *humble Obedience* to its Authority, but practises it, and had rather read an Homily to his Parish, than have the Glory of leading a Sect after his profound Notions, and of giving Authority to the severest Censures upon Men, who are sufficiently unhappy that they cannot conform.

The truly Pious (and such both you and I ought to believe there are amongst them) will, as far as they are able, submit to the Authority that is over them ; and in the mean while, will

will use all diligence to inform their Understandings of the Lawfulness of what is required of them.

For them who are not so, 'tis enough that humane Law has made Conformity their Secular Interest ; and if that won't drive them within the Church-Walls, nothing will.

And now, *Sir*, lest you or I should be carried too far in the heat of Dispute, I shall, instead of that *Ghostly Counsel* which you gave me, in great Charity, set down that of our good Church :

If any Thing be necessary to be taught, reasoned, or disputed, let us do it with all meekness, softness, and lenity : If any Thing shall chance to be spoken uncomely, let one bear another's Frailty : He that is faulty, let him rather amend, than defend that he hath spoken amiss, lest he fall by Contention, from a foolish Error, into an obstinate Heresy.

As you seem careful to clear *Novatianus* from the Guilt of Heresy, in believing that they who had once through Infirmary communicated with Idolaters, could upon no Terms whatever obtain God's Pardon : I cannot tell how far I may have offended beyond the hopes of yours, tho I am,

Reverend Sir,

Yours to serve you,

ANONYMUS.

Family against
Contention,
f. 91.
Vindic. of the
Def. of Dr. St.
p 57.
Not excluded,
&c. for any Er-
ror or Heresy
in Faith, but
for a Schisma-
tical Separati-
on from the
Catholick
Church.

ERRATA.

Page 34. line 32. dele *found*. P. 39. l. 6. read *rigorously*. Ibid.
l. 13. r. *the Jews and Gentiles uniting*. Ibid. l. 17. r. *Jews and
Gentiles*. P. 71. l. 15. r. *Divine-Right* ; l. 16. dele *Divine*. P. 73.
l. 1. r. *Faith*.

to the ... of ...
... who ...
... and ...

... of ...
... in ...

... of ...
... in ...
... of ...

... of ...
... in ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...
... in ...
... of ...

E - PV
24827-42

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE
HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION